

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 961

CE 034 752

TITLE Hearings on Reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Part 17: Postsecondary Vocational Issues. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session on H.R. 66.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 22 Jul 82

NOTE 100p.; Not available in paper copy because of small type. For related documents, see CE 034 753-755 and ED 223 890.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Educational Legislation; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Grants; Hearings; *Postsecondary Education; State Agencies; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS Congress 97th; *Reauthorization Legislation; *Vocational Education Act 1963; Vocational Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

The discussion in this hearing, centering on extension of the appropriations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, focuses on issues related to postsecondary vocational education. Testimony includes statements and prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials from nine individuals representing Illinois Eastern Community College; the Division of Vocational Education, Florida State Department of Education; Eastern Kentucky University; the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress; SER Jobs for Progress, Inc.; Office of Legislation, United States Department of Education; and the United States Department of Education, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education. (YLB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED224961

HEARINGS ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Part 17: Postsecondary Vocational Issues

HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

CN

H.R. 66

TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
UNDER THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON
JULY 22, 1982

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1982

90-542 O

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

CE 034752

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

JOHN N. ERLBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MILLCENT FENWICK, New Jersey
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
EUGENE JOHNSTON, North Carolina
LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on July 22, 1982	1
Statement of—	
Lutes, Diane L., assistant to the chancellor, Illinois Eastern Community College	22
20	
Mills, Joe D., State director, Division of Vocational Education, Florida State Department of Education	9
Rowlett, John D., vice president for academic affairs and research, Eastern Kentucky University	2
Wilson, Richard E., vice president for Federal relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges	26
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—	
American Association of State Colleges and Universities, prepared statement by	7
"Availability of Data With Regard to Vocational Education Programs at Postsecondary Institutions, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress	93
Gomes, Anthony, deputy national director, SER Jobs For Progress, Inc., Washington, D.C.:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated July 6, 1982	74
"The Federal Role in Vocational Education," position paper (draft)	76
Mills, Joe D., State director, Division of Vocational Education, Florida State Department of Education, prepared statement of	14
Pirius, James, office of legislation, U.S. Department of Education, letter from Chairman Perkins requesting additional information, dated August 18, 1982	72
Wilson, Richard E., vice president for Federal relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, "Putting America Back To Work," a concept paper entitled	33
Worthington, Robert M., Ph.D., assistant secretary for vocational and adult education, U.S. Department of Education:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins enclosing additional information, dated September 13, 1982	72
Prepared statement of	58

HEARINGS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Part 17: Postsecondary Vocational Issues

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1982

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:25 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Simon, Kildee, Erdahl, Petri, and Craig.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Nancy Kober, legislative specialist.

Chairman PERKINS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is continuing hearings today on the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

This morning we will focus on those issues related to postsecondary vocational education.

The Vocational Education Act requires States to use 15 percent of their basic grants for postsecondary and adult education. We are interested in learning how these funds are being used and whether this set-aside should be increased or decreased.

The 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Act also reaffirmed the concept of a single agency at the State level to administer vocational education programs. However, consultation with representatives of other State agencies, institutions, and constituencies in planning programs is required.

We would like to hear the witnesses' views on whether the single State agency provision is working, the role of postsecondary agencies and institutions in State governance, and any recommendations for improving the vocational education governance structure.

We have a distinguished panel of witnesses this morning and I am delighted to welcome you all.

We have Dr. John Rowlett, vice president for academic affairs and research at Eastern Kentucky University; Joe D. Mills, State director, Division of Vocational Education, Florida State Department of Education; Diane L. Lutes, assistant to the chancellor, Illinois Eastern Community College; and Richard Wilson, vice presi-

(1)

dent for Federal relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

We are delighted to welcome the entire panel here this morning. We will hear from you first, Dr. Rowelett.

We will hold all our questions until we hear from the whole panel.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. ROWLETT, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH, EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Dr. ROWLETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is John D. Rowlett and I serve as vice president for academic affairs and research and dean of the faculties at Eastern Kentucky University.

I am beginning my 32d year as a member of the faculty at this institution and hold the academic rank of professor of industrial education and technology.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony to the subcommittee concerning the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, it is an understatement to say that we live in troubled times—I sense more anxieties among people at all age levels than I have ever observed in my professional career.

Adults are worried about the future of their jobs, their businesses, and for those who are older, what retirement will hold for them and whether or not the social security program to which many have contributed for 30 or 40 years will really be of assistance to them.

Many young people have a profound concern about the future—whether or not they will be able to find employment—whether or not they will ever be able to own a home. These concerns are not isolated, they are nationwide.

As a society, we have an obligation through our diverse scheme of educational institutions to offer programs that will equip individuals for effective citizenship. And part of this equipment must be the motivation to want to work, and a base of knowledge and skills necessary to enter the labor market and to succeed in it.

Vocational education, whatever else it may be, is concerned with preparing people for gainful employment—for work—young people, middle-aged people, and older people.

Vocational education is typically school based, it is in comprehensive high schools, in vocational schools, in post-secondary technical institutes, in community colleges, and in 4-year colleges and universities.

Although this still is not recognized by some, 4-year colleges and universities offer a broad range of programs. I will comment on those a bit later to prepare people for work.

Vocational education programs are supposed to mirror existing and emerging opportunities for gainful employment in occupations requiring less-than-baccalaureate-level preparation.

The Congress demonstrated its concern for preparing people for work when it passed the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. This act stated, in effect, that preparing people for work is not just a local concern but it is a national concern, and our Federal Government entered into a partnership with the States to promote the development and maintenance of vocational programs.

Subsequent amendments to this act were basically additive in nature until, Mr. Chairman, through your leadership, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 became public law. The changes in this act were farreaching.

And of significance to my testimony today, the 1963 act removed the barrier to funding vocational programs at colleges and universities as long as they are less-than-baccalaureate-level programs located at community colleges and at senior colleges and universities.

For the first time these funds could be used for supporting vocational technical types of programs located on college campuses.

This permitted for the first time vocational education funds to be used to provide partial financial support for associate degree programs that are designed to prepare people for gainful employment. Associate degree programs are offered by community colleges and by a number of senior colleges and universities.

The institution that I represent is a regional State university that enrolled this past fall over 13,500 students in associate, baccalaureate, and graduate programs.

There are over 350 institutions in this Nation that are similar to Eastern. Most began as normal schools for the preparation of teachers and over the years evolved into multipurpose regional State colleges and universities.

These institutions are often referred to as "schools of opportunity." Many have open-admissions policies and subscribe to the principle of low tuition.

I received my undergraduate degree from an institution of this type in Texas following World War II with the assistance of the GI bill that provided me initially with \$65 and later \$75 per month for living costs.

In the fall of 1981, 43 percent of the students enrolled at Eastern Kentucky University came from Appalachian counties, many from your congressional district, Mr. Chairman.

And 51 percent of these students were from communities of fewer than 10,000 in population. Over half of our students at our university are from communities of less than 10,000 students.

This past fall, over 70 percent of our full-time undergraduate students received some type of financial assistance. This is understandable when you consider that 58 percent of these students came from families with annual incomes of less than \$20,000—58 percent.

We are still very much a "school of opportunity." Al Smith, the past Federal cochairman of the Appalachia Regional Commission, told our 1982 graduating class—and I quote:

You were fortunate to find your way to this particular school which emphasizes training for jobs for tomorrow rather than replacement positions for obsolescent industries and crowded occupations of yesterday.

Eastern Kentucky University offers a broad range of baccalaureate and graduate programs in the traditional liberal arts fields, in business, and in teacher education. These are high quality programs that attract many able students to our campus.

The major units of the academic organization of Eastern Kentucky University consists of nine undergraduate colleges, a graduate school, and an office for undergraduate studies.

The college of allied health and nursing departments covers associate degree nursing, baccalaureate nursing, emergency medical care, health record science, medical assisting, medical technology, occupational therapy, and environmental health.

The college of applied arts and technology departments covers agriculture, home economics, industrial education and technology, mass communications, and military science.

The college of arts and humanities departments covers art, English, foreign languages, humanities, music, philosophy and religion, and speech and theater arts.

The college of business departments covers accounting, business administration, business education and office administration, economics, and finance and business systems.

The college of education departments offers administration, counseling, and educational studies, curriculum and instruction, special education, and model laboratory school.

The college of health, physican education, recreation and athletics departments covers health education, health, physican education, recreation, and athletic services, physical education, and recreation and park administration.

The college of law enforcement departments covers correctional services, fire prevention and control, police administration, traffic safety, and security.

The college of natural and mathematical sciences departments covers biological sciences, chemistry, geology, mathematical sciences, natural sciences, and physics and astronomy.

And, the college of social and behavioral sciences department covers anthropology, sociology, and social work, geography and planning, history, political science, psychology, and social science.

In addition to the more traditional university degree programs, Eastern offers 29 associate degree programs in such fields as nursing and computer electronics. We graduate 350-400 students from these programs each year.

Our associate degree programs are developed on a career ladder model. In most instances, a graduate of an associate degree program may pursue a baccalaureate program in the same field without loss of academic credit.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, sometimes you hear that college graduates have difficulty finding jobs. This is true in some fields of study.

But let me assure you that the graduates of these programs find jobs—they have the skills and knowledge, developed in a university setting, that are highly regarded in the labor market.

For example, since 1967 we have graduated over 1,200 students with associate degrees in nursing, a 2-year program for the preparation of registered nurses. These graduates can find employment in most any community in this Nation.

A conservative estimate places the current shortage of registered nurses at 100,000. The associate degree program in nursing—and I use this simply as an example—is a postsecondary program that is just as eligible for funding under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, as a postsecondary program in auto mechanics or carpentry or in machine shop.

Need I speculate with you where nursing frequently fits in the scheme of things when it comes to the allocation of postsecondary vocational dollars—near the bottom if it is in the scheme at all.

At our institution we have not received funds for program support for this very critical program for a number of years. In this and other areas—and I would generalize on this because I think it is a nationwide problem in our kind of institution, the dollars just do not flow to these kinds of programs.

This is in spite of the fact that there is a critical national shortage of nurses. This does not make commonsense and I do not think it squares with the intent of Congress.

A companion statement has been distributed to you today from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and is also on behalf of the American Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

I would ask that this be placed in the record in its entirety.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, so ordered.

Dr. ROWLETT. Among other things, this statement includes statistics based on findings of studies that we have conducted at Eastern Kentucky University in cooperation with these two national organizations.

This began in the 1960's and the last study was completed in 1981.

In 1981, there were 185 of these senior colleges and universities offering 2,179 less-than-baccalaureate level technical programs enrolling over 120,000 students.

This is equivalent to 120 postsecondary and vocational schools, each with an enrollment of 1,000 students. This is a significant commitment, and a significant contribution to the employment of people in preparation for jobs for which there is a demand in the labor market.

Ten years earlier, our 1971 study reported 142 institutions offering 1,097 programs and enrolling 57,000 students. We have seen a doubling of both programs and enrollments in this 10-year period.

Yet institutions report that they receive little or none of the postsecondary vocational education dollars to assist in supporting the costs of these programs.

At the postsecondary level, dollars should go to support programs for which there is a high demand for graduates—not just in the local county, but in the Nation.

And these graduates should expect their skills and knowledge base to be transportable throughout the Nation.

I am not at all satisfied with the way the 15-percent set-aside for postsecondary education has worked for senior colleges and universities offering less-than-baccalaureate level programs.

Some system must be developed, if in fact it is the intent of Congress that these Federal funds are to follow programs, not levels of

institutions, to insure that all postsecondary institutions offering eligible programs are treated in an equitable manner.

I think it is time that the "sole State agency" clause be amended to permit the State to have the latitude to use a separate board for the administration of postsecondary vocational education dollars if they should so choose.

Some system needs to be developed to insure that these dollars flow toward the support of programs that produce graduates that are badly needed in our labor market today.

I support the set-aside for postsecondary and vocational and technical programs. I would very much like to see it increased.

But I would not like to see it increased at the expense of our secondary vocational programs. These programs have merit. They have great merit on their own right. They serve a great need for the youngsters who are enrolled in our secondary schools.

I would not like to see support diminished for these particular programs.

What this means is, in substance, that we need more money for vocational education at all levels as opposed to fewer dollars.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, as stated in the testimony that has been distributed, raises questions about the concept of a single sole State agency for the administration of vocational programs.

It is the position of this organization that this ought to be loosened up a bit and give the States an opportunity to look at other ways of managing programs if the States so choose to look at other ways.

It does not forbid the use of a sole State agency, but would simply open up other avenues should a State decide that other avenues would be better.

From a personal standpoint, I think somewhere along the way we need to have specific and explicit provisions that will mandate that 4-year colleges and universities that are involved in preparing less-than-baccalaureate graduates for gainful employment, are represented and represented very directly as a part of the State planning process.

At least I think a spot should be reserved on the State advisory council for vocational education.

In closing, let me state that the relationship of my university with the personnel in our State Bureau of Vocational Education has been excellent—many of them received degrees from Eastern Kentucky University which is also the case with Dr. Robert Worthington, the current Assistant Secretary for Vocational Education of the U.S. Department of Education.

We receive more postsecondary vocational dollars than most of our sister institutions.

However, the funding is woefully inadequate. There are not enough postsecondary vocational dollars in Kentucky to assist all programs that should receive support.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your continued vigorous and effective leadership in support of vocational education programs, wherever they may be located in our system of public secondary and higher education, and for the opportunity provided me today to share my views with you and members of the committee.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. We want to thank you very much.
We will hold questions until the rest of the panel testifies.
[Statement referred to follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES

This statement is to accompany testimony by Dr. John D. Rowlett, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, Eastern Kentucky University, on behalf of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The statement is also offered on behalf of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Council on Education.

This statement will deal with the following issues:

1. The contribution of four-year colleges and universities to vocational education.
2. The need to change the "sole state agency" clause in current law.
3. The need to provide for adequate state planning, including the involvement of all types of postsecondary institutions.
4. The need to increase the present 15 percent set-aside for postsecondary and adult education.
5. The current administration bill, S. 2325, and administration recommended appropriation levels for vocational education.

I. THE CONTRIBUTION OF FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A series of studies made by Dr. John D. Rowlett, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research at Eastern Kentucky University, have clearly shown that four-year colleges make a major but largely unrecognized contribution to providing less-than-baccalaureate vocational education. The most recent study, in 1982, revealed that over 100,000 students, attending 185 four-year institutions, were enrolled in some 2,000 separate programs. The programs included a wide range of occupational, technical, health-related, business-related, and other fields.

However, these institutions reported that they received little or no federal aid under the Vocational Education Act (VEA) for these programs. It has always been a general principle that federal support should go to whatever institutions offer programs which meet a national purpose—that federal law should not discriminate by designating certain types of institutions. This is true in almost all programs administered under the Higher Education Act, as well as programs involving funds for research, training, and veterans education.

In the Vocational Education Act, however, Congress has left it to the complete discretion of the "sole state agency" how funds will be allocated. Some states have chosen to give all or most funds for the operation of vocational education programs to postsecondary area schools (sometimes schools created for that purpose), after bypassing community colleges already offering the same programs. In other states, community colleges have been included, but four-year colleges have been excluded in almost every state.

In other words, a particular occupational program may receive generous federal aid at a community college, but an identical program offered at a four-year college may receive no aid at all.

Rowlett's earlier studies in 1971 and 1975 also showed that many four-year colleges offer occupational programs. These as well as the 1981 study, were made with the cooperation of AASCU and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant colleges (NASULGC).

Today, more colleges than ever are developing vocational courses, in response to the needs of the time. Four-year colleges like other institutions are aware of the need to revitalize American industry and to train the skilled people needed for modern industry and our defense needs. But programs are being cut back in many states because of state fiscal problems, at the same time these programs do not receive federal funds for which they legally qualify.

The 1981 Rowlett study for the first time asked a series of questions about the extent to which four-year colleges receive federal VEA money, whether for the operating costs of vocational programs, or for such other purposes as teacher training, curriculum development, research, or various special projects. Here are the results:

Almost all colleges reported that they received no VEA funds for the operating costs of programs at the less-than-baccalaureate level.

A small number of colleges received some funds through the state agencies for training secondary-school vocational teachers.

A considerably smaller number received funds, often only a few thousand dollars, for such purposes as curriculum development, research, and special projects. Again, this was at the discretion of the state agencies.

In conclusion, one can only say that the vast majority of four-year colleges, educating as they do a majority of all American college students, are receiving almost no federal VEA assistance.

2. THE "SOLE STATE AGENCY" ISSUE

Many of the problems which postsecondary institutions have had with the VEA since the 1963 legislation can be traced in part to the "sole state strategy agency" clause, Sec. 104(a)(1) of the VEA law as amended. Not only must a sole state agency administer the program, but in almost every state this is the agency with primary responsibility for elementary-secondary education. But practically all states now administer postsecondary or higher education through a separate board or boards.

For years, both two-year and four-year college spokesmen have maintained that in many states the elementary-secondary boards or vocational education staffs do not understand the needs and problems of postsecondary education. They see many state agencies as oriented toward the more traditional high-school-level courses, and unaware of changes in technology and the labor market which require the more innovative approaches and know-how found in postsecondary schools. Some colleges have also objected to what they consider the relatively arbitrary way in which awards may be made by the state agencies.

We believe the most governors, state legislators, and state higher education agencies would welcome the greater flexibility which would come, with giving each state the option to administer postsecondary VEA funds through a different board. Such flexibility is certainly in tune with the moves to decentralize decision-making to the states, which this administration has called for.

We urge Congress to amend or eliminate the sole state agency clause, and give each state the discretion to administer federal VEA funds as it wishes.

3. ADEQUATE STATE PLANNING

The present VEA law includes a fairly elaborate series of steps intended to involve postsecondary institutions in state planning related to the use of federal VEA funds. Language in Secs. 105-109 calls for a State advisory Council representing community colleges and other post-secondary institutions. It calls for annual evaluation reports from each state submitted to the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. It also calls (sec. 107) for the involvement of state agencies responsible for community colleges and other higher education institutions, in the development of state plans. It includes appeals procedures, including the possibility of court challenges.

All this language was added to the VEA in order to assure that not only postsecondary education but many other interests—the disadvantaged, the handicapped, bilingual groups, women, as well as labor, industry, and the public—would be involved in the planning process.

Similarly, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (Sec. 162) was intended to represent postsecondary education and all others with an interest in these programs.

The 1981 Rowlett survey revealed that the state planning process is not working very well, if at all, as far as many four-year college spokesmen are concerned. If there is any "representation", it may be an official in a state postsecondary agency who may have many other priorities. Cases in which a state plan or decisions about the allocations of funds have been challenged appear to be rare. This may reflect simply an awareness that, given a sole state agency, such appeals may fall on deaf ears.

We do not suggest Federal legislation to change the state planning process. We suggest changing the sole state agency clause, and alerting state governors, legislators, and higher education institutions of their responsibilities.

4. THE 15-PERCENT POSTSECONDARY SET-ASIDE

The adoption of this feature of the bill in 1968 undoubtedly encouraged many states to expand their assistance to the postsecondary sector. We believe that it should be increased, if possible.

5. THE ADMINISTRATION VEA BILL AND APPROPRIATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

We are in general agreement with testimony given by the American Vocational Association (AVA) on July 1, 1982, before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, criticizing the administration bill (S. 2325) on Vocational and adult education. We feel that this bill has many shortcomings.

Most important, at a time of universal agreement that much more should be done to strengthen the American economy, the bill and administration budget policy sharply reduced Federal spending. As the AVA pointed out, spending would fall from \$784 million in fiscal year 1980 to \$432 million in fiscal year 1983, a 45 percent drop at a time of rapidly increasing inflation. The current fiscal year 1982 figure of \$653 million, likely to be adopted for fiscal year 1983, as well, is already too low. The AVA believes that a complete phase-out of VEA is planned by the administration over the next few years.

The combination in the proposed new law of grandiose Federal purposes, and far less money (as well as much less Federal oversight over the money), is a guarantee that the proposed new VEA would be far less effective in meeting national or local needs than the present program.

The administration bill also fails to deal with some of the specific issues raised above, and would simply make the existing situation worse:

- It retains the sole state agency feature.

- It does away with any postsecondary set-aside.

- It does eliminate almost the entire state planning process in the present law.

- It does not require postsecondary representation on the National Advisory Council. It does not specify any kind of representation, except to say (sec. 107) that a majority of members shall be non-educators.

- In conclusion, we urge Congress:

- Give more attention to the contribution of four-year as well as two year colleges in the VEA program.

- Change the sole state agency clause, so that postsecondary institutions and agencies can administer their own funds.

- Consider increasing the 15 percent postsecondary set-aside.

- Reject the administration VEA bill as well as administration recommendations for much lower overall funding levels.

Chairman PERKINS. We will next hear from Joe D. Mills, State director, Division of Vocational Education, Florida State Department of Education.

We welcome you here.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOE D. MILLS, STATE DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, FLORIDA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Joe Mills, State director, Division of Vocational Education with the State Department in Florida.

I am president-elect of the American Vocational Association and I am here representing AVA.

I certainly thank you for the opportunity to discuss the issues at hand.

Having been involved in the business of vocational education for some 35 years now—I left the Navy in 1946 right after World War II and got into vocational education—I have seen the fantastic growth.

I can speak to the great extent of the growth we have had in Florida, particularly in the area of postsecondary education.

Being rather knowledgeable of the legislative history of vocational education, I am well aware of the strong congressional interest that has had over the years in training and retraining of adults.

We find that in our 1968 amendments we had the identification of certain dollars—some 15 percent—for vocational programs.

I think it is important for us to understand that what we are talking about is the concept of vocational education as a program.

I personally have a responsibility in my State as one of four divisions responsible for the delivery of vocational education under a single State board of education, which is the Governor and the cabinet.

In this position we have, we are a programmatic division, and we are responsible for vocational education across all levels of education.

So from that standpoint, I think we are aware of the problems as it relates to government.

We have vocational education across this country, as we well know, in secondary schools, in technical institutions, in community colleges, in area vocational schools, and in universities and colleges, as well as a very big element in vocational education, which is the private sector.

We coordinate very much with that private sector.

I am here first of all to state the position of the American Vocational Association and also to respond to the three questions which you have addressed to me at this time.

First of all, I would like to take the three questions, if I may, and make a quick response to those.

Question number one is: How is the 15-percent set-aside in the act for postsecondary and adult education working and to your knowledge, have States met this regulation and how are the funds being used?

I would say to you that from my knowledge of working with other States, that the 15-percent set-aside is working and has performed a great function so far as the movement of our postsecondary programs is concerned.

I think the States certainly must be meeting this regulation because by law they have to. I do not know of any State that has been deprived of the dollars because they have not met the regulations.

The second question is: Should this set-aside be continued and should it be increased or decreased?

From my standpoint, I think you need to increase the dollar support at this particular issue.

The issue of governance is the third question and whether the sole State agencies should be retained and how the provisions requiring consultation with other State agencies are working.

I tell you that they are working well. I think I can give you an example. I know the other States are working in this regard.

When you put this in the legislation that we should be working with other agencies, this had already been taking place for many, many years.

A good example of where we are today in terms of agency coordination—keeping in mind that in our State we have a division of public schools, a division of community colleges, and a division of universities called the board of regents.

I represent the programmatic division across all those, which is the vocational division.

We work very well together so far as this is concerned. I feel very strongly that in the majority of the States that this is taking place.

The other element with State agencies is this. I will give you one good example.

With the employment service in the State of Florida, where they have been cut back in support to the point they have closed offices, we have now opened three offices of employment service in area vocational centers across our State. We will open 12 more.

We have found that in the first three we have opened, in one case, in the case of Tampa, we have more business in that school office than one of the major offices downtown.

The value of that is that we are bringing the unemployed individual in close contact with the institutions and vice versa. We are bringing the students and the institutions in close contact with the employment services.

I can cite you many, many other examples of where we are working in that regard.

So, I would say to you that a sole State agency that has the responsibility for coordinating the total program in a given State in this time of slackening dollars as we have—and we have a 10 percent downfall as far as our State revenue in Florida is concerned—and it is going to be more important that we have that coordination to eliminate any duplication of effort and to make certain we cover all elements.

Those are the three questions that you addressed. I responded to them.

But in terms of the position of the American Vocational Association, we are for a 30-percent set-aside. We feel that with the emphasis today in the labor market and the growing emphasis in a change in the demands for the types of individuals that we are training, that we have a changing role which is taking place.

We have had a movement in high technology, particularly in what we consider the area of postsecondary education.

So, from the standpoint of the Association, we are together on an increase of some 30 percent.

I say that this idea was not arrived at simply by one meeting or so. We had over 100 business educators working together and business people and educators and industry people working together.

We came to this particular decision.

The second point in terms of AVA is that there should be only one system of State governance for programs of vocational education within the State.

If we take the premise that we are talking about—programs and not about levels of education, then it makes commonsense that if you are going to coordinate things you have to have a single agency to pull all these facts and figures together.

I say to you that if we are an example of what can be done in terms of a single State agency coordinating it for all levels of education, I think we are doing the job.

Therefore, the position of the American Vocational Association is such that we believe in one system of State governance.

We realize there are major issues in some States where the governance is under a board of K through 12. This has presented problems.

But we still feel that that responsibility for making that decision should be at the State level.

New legislation, we think, should focus on skills training and retraining of adults. Again, this is a big program. As you look at the program across the country—and I think the majority of us would call a great deal of this supplemental training.

It is one of the big programs that we support in our State of Florida. My review across the country is that we are probably, in terms of number of people being served institutionally through all institutions, we do more in short-term supplemental training and upgrading of people, than we do in basic skills training, regardless of the institution.

For your information, sometimes we get confused as to what postsecondary institutions are. I think they encompass a broad field.

We have over 500 institutions who are postsecondary who are not associate degree programs. We have over 1,500 programs in the country that are not only postsecondary, but serving secondary simply because of the geography of the institution, the size of the population.

Historically if you came to Florida 15 years ago, we had about six physical facilities giving vocational education at the postsecondary level.

One was an old hotel in Miami that had been converted. In Tampa was an old proprietary institution that had been taken over. I could go to Jacksonville and show you another old institution.

Another one would have been a junior high school and a senior high school.

We are proud to say that we have 32 in the last 15 years. As a result of the 1963 act, we have 32 modern area vocational centers.

In addition, we have 28 of our community colleges—14 of them which have been classified as area vocational schools. We think they are well equipped and we think that we are ready to serve the population of the State of Florida as well as this country.

If you will look at the transfer of people into our State, we are beginning to serve an awful lot of people down there.

I think the thing I am proudest of in terms of the total country is that I think we have the best darn system in the world.

I have visited Japan. I have visited Germany and elsewhere. We have the potential today at any given time with facilities and staffing, with some fiscal support for increased use of these institutions.

We have the potential to train every person that we need to train in America. We can assume a role which I think we have had in the past and will have in the future and that is in the matter of national defense.

I think we could go into business tomorrow, as we are doing in Florida. We are working with two military agencies. We are going to start ground training for naval pilots at Pensacola. We are doing some other things in that regard.

I simply state that the institutions are that flexible and they are ready to do the job.

We think there should be continued support—and again I am speaking of the American Vocational Association—for adult basic education.

We still have a problem of adults. I think of adults of 16 or above, who are leaving our secondary programs, who have not received all of the basic skills.

But they are willing to come back at a later date when the demand is placed upon them to have these basic skills and get these basic skills.

I strongly support, and the AVA strongly supports, this growth in adult basic education.

We also think—and this is the fifth point of the American Vocational Association's position—that the new legislation should provide a uniform definition for postsecondary and adult vocational education.

Postsecondary and adult vocational education should be treated as a program for serving post-high-school youth and adults.

It is an organized program of instruction for persons who have completed or left high school and for persons who have already entered the labor market but who are unemployed.

We know that these programs give credit on the associate degree level. Therefore, we strongly request that you give consideration to the uniform definition of postsecondary and adult education.

I have a couple of minutes left, Mr. Chairman. I would like to tell you about some of the things that I think are also taking place which have been instigated by the legislation we have had.

For instance, in the whole field of computer technology, we now have a system in our State where we have a terminal in every one of our institutions that on any given morning, a student can step up to the terminal and know what jobs are available in any part of our State.

We find that this is happening elsewhere in the country. We have a system whereby on a 3-times-a-year basis we send out to 25,000 employers the names of all the graduates of our institutions so they can contact them. They contain addresses and telephone numbers.

All of these things have been done, quite frankly, simply because we have had that unique thing of the Federal dollar which has been the real key dollar in the growth in some of the quality things we are doing in vocational education.

Much of it has been centered in our postsecondary institutions.

In summary, I would like to say that throughout the history of the Federal involvement in vocational education, the Federal role has recognized that vocational education is a program and it can be funded. It is manageable and accountable.

Federal legislation has recognized that vocational education is the primary responsibility of the State and local governments.

One of the things that we believe in very strongly in our State—and I know it is true elsewhere—and that is local control at the local school level.

Sometimes in our State it is a real hindrance to the things we do. But it still is a very strong effort.

However, because of the institutional setting for vocational education which varies from State to State—and it varies within our State—and it varies from community to community, we find that the legislation should call for a single State agency to coordinate vocational education.

I would digress from the prepared statement to say that I think the Congress of the United States, through your great efforts, should help us identify the goals, the policies, and where we need to go so far as our national needs are concerned.

We have the responsibility of tying those together with the needs that we have in our individual States which are different and the needs we have in our individual communities.

I think the end result of that can be a continuing program that will be in a position and is in a position today to do just about anything you folks ask for in the way of meeting the needs of America's labor force for upgrading and uptraining.

It is a real pleasure for me to be here and make these few comments. Normally my presentations are before the legislature in the State of Florida. They are a little more tenuous at that time because we are asking for a fairly large sum of money to operate our programs in the State.

My experience is a little bit different. But it is a pleasure to be here. I sincerely hope you will ask questions. I think I can do better in response to some of those than in the formal presentation.

I would ask that my complete statement be placed in the record at this point.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, so ordered.

[Prepared statement of Joe Mills follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOE D. MILLS, STATE DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, FLORIDA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am Joe Mills, State Director, Division of Vocational education with the State Department of Education in Tallahassee, Florida. I am President-Elect of the American Vocational Association. On behalf of the AVA members, thank you for the opportunity to discuss issues surrounding postsecondary and adult vocational and technical education.

The education and training of our nation's citizens at the post-secondary and adult level has shown tremendous growth in recent years. However, we in the profession are very much aware of the need to increase emphasis on training and retraining of adults and the need for vocational programs to place more emphasis on being a part of the total economic growth and development of our nation.

A review of legislative history dating back to the early 1900's reveals a strong congressional interest in training and retraining of adults. Continuing this emphasis, the House Education and Labor Committee in 1968, acted to make sure that at least 15 percent of the Vocational Education Act funds were used for postsecondary and adult programs. This special emphasis has been maintained by Congress in subsequent years.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS A PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, throughout all these years members of Congress have agreed that vocational education is a program. On this basis they set purposes and objectives for federal funds and establish priorities for programs. Actions of Congress have reflected that vocational education occurs in many and varied settings and that determination of the administrative and institutional setting occurs at the state and local levels. The membership of the American Vocational Association agrees with this premise. Vocational education occurs in secondary schools, technical institutes, community colleges, area vocational schools, and universities and colleges, as well as the private sector. It is a program available for people of all ages, youth and adults. The members of AVA feel that because Congress has treated vocational education as a

program, it has greatly assisted and encouraged the growth and expansion of vocational education so that our programs are the best in the world.

AVA POSITION ON POSTSECONDARY AND ADULT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

With the recognition of an expanded emphasis on postsecondary and adult vocational education, AVA includes specific recommendations in its position for new legislation. AVA positions were arrived at deliberately and with significant membership involvement. They represent the thinking of more than 100 vocational educators who worked for three years with representatives of business, industry, agriculture, and organized labor to arrive at a series of recommendations. Our positions have been approved by the AVA Assembly of Delegates which is the policy delegation for the association.

In summary, AVA's positions on postsecondary and adult vocational education are:

1. Thirty percent (30 percent) of the vocational education basic state grant should be reserved for postsecondary and adult programs.

AVA members feel that the basic state grant should be used to improve the quality of vocational education instruction and to keep programs current with workplace requirements. These funds should be available to extend programs and to develop new programs to meet labor market needs, as well as to improve local practices, processes and materials. It is essential that postsecondary and adult programs have adequate federal funds to assist with program improvement activities.

2. There should be only one system of state governance for programs of vocational education within the state.

A sole State Board should be responsible for administering all state level functions associated with federal vocational education and training at all education levels. The appropriate State Board should be designated by state law with membership either elected or appointed. The State Board should employ sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities as determined by the State Board. This staff should be directed by a qualified State Director for vocational education and training.

This position does not imply a separate Board. It will, however, enable the states to designate one Board to be accountable for programs and expenditures of federal lands.

3. New vocational education legislation should focus on skilled training and re-training for adults.

Any new federal legislation should contain a component with separate authorization to give vocational education the capacity to respond to the growing employment training needs for adults. These needs are the result of economic development, industrialization, work displacement and displaced homemakers. While these programs will be conducted in a variety of institutional settings, the emphasis must remain on the program, purposes and the relationships that must be established among these programs, employers and community.

4. There should continued to be separate and distinct legislation for adult basic education.

The purposes of adult basic education are such that federal initiatives continue to be needed. Approximately 25 percent of the American population does not complete high school. This means that high school completion and literacy programs are needed for approximately 25 percent of the nation's population. High school literacy and basic adult education cannot be accomplished only by vocational education programs and personnel, but by the total education system. While it is true that vocational institutions recognize the need for remedial math, science and language as a part of the preparation for jobs, it is AVA's position that adult basic education and vocational education are far too important as programs with separate distinct purposes to have them combined into one block grant.

5. New legislation should provide a uniform definition for postsecondary and adult vocational education.

Postsecondary and adult vocational education should be treated as a program for serving post high school youth and adults. It is an organized program of instruction for persons who have completed or left high school and/or for persons who have already entered the labor market or who are unemployed. These programs may give credit toward an associate or other degree not designed as a baccalaureate or higher degree or they may give a certificate or diploma upon completion. The length of time assigned a course of study will vary according to the purpose of the program.

RATIONALE FOR AVA POSITIONS

1. Thirty percent of vocational education funds to go to postsecondary and adults: Changes in technology and requirements of the workplace are creating a demand for greater attention to postsecondary and adult training and retraining.

The workforce of America is evolving toward higher levels of skill training. Bidding among employers for skilled workers will continue to increase and those who have the necessary skills will be employed, in fact, they will be able to take their pick of the jobs. Those who lack skills will, most likely, go unemployed. In 1950 approximately 34 percent of all jobs in the labor market were available to those who did not have a high school diploma. This figure has decreased to approximately 8 percent by 1970. There is evidence to believe that in the 1980's that figure has declined even more. The tables on the following pages (Chart 1, 2 and 3) tell the story, they project the fastest growing jobs, the jobs with the most openings and the changes expected in employment by major occupational groups between 1978 and 1990. Postsecondary and adult vocational education prepares individuals for 18 of the 26 fastest growing jobs and 22 of the 27 jobs with the greatest number of potential openings.

The changing nature of the American workforce, with an increased emphasis on high technology is creating a need for a stronger emphasis on adult training and retraining. Information processing, telecommunications, computer technologies, robotics, automation and the bio-technical revolution are all instruments of fundamental change in the American workplace. Since changes in the technology base drives the economy of the United States, it is incumbent upon Congress to make sure that vocational education for adults and postsecondary students is integral to this nation's total job training efforts.

Chart 1.—Fastest growing jobs, 1978-90

Occupation:	Annual openings
*Bank clerks.....	45,000
Bank officers and financial managers.....	28,000
*Business machine repairers.....	4,200
City managers.....	350
*Computer service technicians.....	5,400
*Construction inspectors.....	2,200
*Dental assistants.....	11,000
*Dental hygienists.....	6,000
Dining room attendants and dishwashers.....	37,000
*Flight attendants.....	4,800
*Guards.....	70,000
Health service administrators.....	18,000
*Homemaker-home health aides.....	36,000
*Industrial machinery repairers.....	58,000
*Landscape architects.....	1,100
*Licensed practical nurses.....	60,000
*Lithographers.....	2,300
*Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants.....	94,000
Occupational therapists.....	2,500
*Occupational therapy assistants.....	1,100
Physical therapists.....	2,700
*Podiatrists.....	600
*Respiratory therapy workers.....	5,000
Speech pathologists and audiologists.....	3,900
*Teacher aides.....	26,000
*Travel agents.....	1,900

*Items indicate field in which vocational education is available.

Note.—For these occupations, employment in 1990 is projected to be at least 50 percent higher than it was in 1978.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, spring, 1980.

Chart 2.—Jobs with the most openings, 1978-90

Occupation:	Annual openings
*Secretaries and stenographers.....	305,000
*Retail sales workers.....	226,000
*Building custodians.....	180,000
*Cashiers.....	119,000
*Bookkeeping workers.....	96,000
*Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants.....	94,000
*Cooks and chefs.....	86,000
Kindergarten and elementary teachers.....	86,000
*Registered nurses.....	85,000
*Assemblers.....	77,000
*Waiters and waitresses.....	70,000
*Guards.....	70,000
*Blue-collar worker/supervisors.....	69,000
*Local truck drivers.....	64,000
*Accountants.....	61,000
*Licensed practical nurses.....	60,000
*Typists.....	59,000
*Carpenters.....	58,000
*Industrial machinery repairers.....	58,000
Real estate agents and brokers.....	50,000
*Construction laborers.....	49,000
Engineers.....	46,500
*Bank clerks.....	45,000
Private household workers.....	45,000
*Receptionists.....	41,000
*Wholesale trade sales workers.....	40,000

*Items indicate fields in which vocational education is available.

NOTE.—Replacement needs and growth are projected to cause these occupations to offer the largest numbers of openings. Competition for openings will vary by occupation.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, spring, 1980.

CHART 3.—PROJECTED CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1978-90

Occupational group	Employment			Openings		
	1978	Projected 1990	Percent change ¹	Total	Growth	Replacements ²
White-collar workers.....	47,205	58,400	23.6	36,800	11,200	25,600
Professional and technical workers.....	14,245	16,900	18.3	8,300	2,600	5,700
Managers and administrators, except farm.....	10,105	12,200	20.8	7,100	2,100	5,000
Sales workers.....	5,951	7,600	27.7	4,800	1,700	3,100
Clerical workers.....	16,904	21,700	28.4	16,600	4,800	11,800
Blue collar workers.....	31,531	36,600	16.1	16,200	5,100	11,100
Craft workers.....	12,386	14,900	20.0	7,000	2,500	4,500
Operatives except transport.....	10,875	12,500	15.0	5,600	1,600	4,000
Transport operatives.....	3,541	4,100	16.2	1,700	600	100
Nonfarm laborers.....	4,729	5,100	8.1	2,000	400	600
Service workers.....	12,839	16,700	29.9	12,200	3,800	8,400
Private household workers.....	1,162	900	-23.2	500	-300	800
Other service workers.....	11,677	15,800	35.2	11,700	4,100	7,600
Farmworkers.....	2,798	2,400	-15.9	1,300	-400	1,700
Total.....	94,373	114,000	20.8	66,400	19,600	46,800

¹ Calculated from unrounded figures.

² Due to deaths, retirements, and other separations from the labor force. Does not include transfers out of occupations.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, spring, 1980. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that there will be an average of 5,500,000 job openings annually through 1990. Nearly 20,000,000 jobs will be new and the remaining openings will be replacements. Some shifts in vocational education enrollment patterns will be required to assure that program completers will be trained in areas of demand. Often change is slow because it is cheaper to continue out-of-date programs than to close them and open new ones; new vocational programs require new capital investment. Yet it is in the Nation's interest to have workers prepared in fields where there are opportunities for employment.

In addition to technology changes, projected alteration of the composition of the labor force is also bringing about the need for increased attention to adult training and retraining. During the next decade the generation entering the workforce will be considerably smaller than in the 1960's and 1970's. The workforce of the 1980's and 1990's will rely more heavily on older workers. The predominance of the American population (approximately 25 million people) in 1980 was in the 17-24 year old age group. In 1990 this age group will drop to approximately 20 million persons and by the year 2000 it will be approximately 16 million people. Conversely the age group comprised of those in their late 30's and mid 40's will make up the largest group in the workforce by the year 2000. Stated simply the majority of the workforce will be older. In the past the shifting demands by the various industries and occupations have been met by younger workers who are just beginning their careers. This cannot be projected to be the case in the future and the problems will have to be met by older workers.

(Source.—The Bureau of Labor Statistics in an unpublished Report of the 1970 census.)

THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION MAY VARY FROM STATE TO STATE, COMMUNITY TO COMMUNITY

In spite of the provisions of Federal and State legislation the program of vocational education is administered, planned and coordinated at the local institutional level. Services rendered at the local level determine the outcome of State and Federal policy. Therefore, it is imperative that Federal legislation recognize that vocational education is a program cutting across institutions and age levels and that funds be set aside for these programs.

The diversity of administrative patterns at the local level means that vocational education can be perceived to be many different things to different people. The reality is that vocational education is many different programs delivered in many different settings. These settings have been developed by local governance structures in the states and territories. These governance structures are as varied and diverse as the states and territories themselves. Thus as new legislation is developed it must be remembered that the delivery of vocational education is a function of the many and varied State and local institutions and delivery systems and that Federal legislation must continue to treat vocational education as a program if it is to be flexible enough to meet the needs.

There are at least 8 types of institutions offering vocational education in the United States. These institutions are:

General high schools.—General secondary institutions offering more than five programs of vocational education.

Comprehensive high schools.—A comprehensive secondary school offering programs in both vocational and general academic subjects. The majority of the students are not enrolled in vocational education.

Vocational high schools.—A vocational specialized secondary school offering a full time program in both academic and vocational subjects. The majority of the students are enrolled in vocational education programs.

Area vocational center.—A shared time facility providing instruction in vocational education only to students from the region or system. Students receive academic portions of their education in other institutions.

Community colleges.—A two year postsecondary degree granting institution offering both vocational technical and academic transfer programs.

Technical institutes.—A two year postsecondary degree granting institution offering instruction primarily in vocational technical education. Graduates are directed toward immediate job placement, although transfer to other institutions of higher education programs is possible.

Area vocational schools.—A postsecondary non degree granting institution with one or two year programs. Generally not recognized as a transfer program for academic institutions.

Specialized noncollegiate postsecondary schools.—Vocational schools offering one or two occupational areas of a specific employment related nature.

While the eight types of institutions mentioned above can be easily defined, the programs and the students attending these institutions are more nebulous. Throughout the nation, many secondary vocational education laboratories are utilized after school hours and in the evenings for adult programs. In addition, many of the postsecondary laboratories and programs in the community colleges and technical insti-

tutes accommodate high school and adult students for both long term and short term programs. In fact, some states serve both adult and secondary youth at the same time and in the same programs.

2. There should be one system of State governance for vocational education: Co-ordinated State planning and operation by a sole State agency is essential to effective and efficient vocational education in the State.

Since 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act (P.L. 64-347) was enacted, states and the federal government have been partners in providing vocational opportunities for the citizens of the nation. This partnership existed because states have constitutional responsibility for public education and the federal government has responsibility to assure the economic and social well being of its citizens.

It is recognized that states organize educational governance into a variety of administrative structures. Since the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-210) called for creation of a single state agency to administer vocational education, both the states and the federal government have struggled with the question of how best to implement the sole state agency governance mandate.

The primary concern of states is that program coordination exists and that unnecessary duplication in programs is eliminated. This involves institutional coordination in the sense that the allocation of funds to serve geographic regions is essential to the overall welfare of a state.

Problems exist in many states regarding governance. Some states assign responsibility for vocational education to Boards and agencies which have other responsibilities that take precedence over vocational education. In other states the vocational education agencies and Boards lack jurisdiction over the total scope of programs and age groups of persons who could benefit from vocational education. In addition, they may not have jurisdiction over institutions that provide this training. Partly because of this incomplete jurisdiction a variety of administrative structures exist in the states. The scope and level of power of the administrative bodies in the states varies greatly. In general, the governance structure of vocational education can be found to be one of the following:

1. A single state agency governing all levels of education including vocational education.

2. A state Board for elementary and secondary education which also governs vocational education with higher education having a separate governing Board or coordinating agency.

3. A state Board for elementary and secondary education that also governs vocational education but there is no statewide governing or coordinating agency for higher education.

4. A state Board for elementary and secondary education that governs secondary and adult education while a postsecondary technical education board governs post-secondary education.

5. A university Board of Regents that also governs vocational education.

6. A separate State Board governing the program of vocational education with the rest of education being governed by other Boards.

Governance of vocational education is primarily a subsystem in the state administrative offices. Therefore, the authority to perform administrative functions is not clear and the question of where to place vocational education within the state office has come under contention in some states. Thus any new legislation must treat vocational education as a program which cuts across all institutional and geographic lines and transcends the age of the population being served.

Fragmentation of administrative control in a state often leads to inadequate program coordination with duplication in some program areas and not enough attention paid to others. Coordination from the state's administration level is essential because vocational education is a costly program. It uses costly equipment and facilities and must continually be updated, particularly in the area of equipment and instructional supplies, if the program is to be appropriate to the occupation.

A further consideration is that many other state agencies, in addition to the education agency, are conducting programs related to employment and training. Many of these are related to the economic growth and development in a state and are relevant to the same or similar clients. The complicated nature of funds going to these different agencies highlights the need for the sole state agency for planning and operation of vocational education.

In summary, the state governance of education and training programs should be established by state legislation. Federal legislation should require that an adequate governance structure be created as a condition for receiving funds and that the state should accord one state board the sole responsibility for vocational education at all institutional levels.

This is the only way that federal legislation can assure coordinated state planning and operation essential to effective and efficient vocational education in the state.

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF A STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The success of vocational education depends upon the ability to change rapidly, to update programs to meet new technology and to recognize the occupational needs for the future and to deliver these occupational programs in a timely and efficient manner. In order to do this local and state professionals in vocational education need:

1. Technical assistance in the accomplishment of their jobs;
2. Professional leadership and personnel development;
3. Revised curriculum and updated instructional materials;
4. Program standards and personnel certification;
5. Coordination with other groups interested in economic growth and development of the community and of the state.

The role of the State Board for vocational education is one of assisting with and being responsible for administering all of the state level functions associated with federal and state vocational education and training at all education levels. The State Board should have provisions for employing sufficient staff for carrying out its responsibilities and should have a chief executive officer in the form of a state director for vocational education and training that will be responsible to the Board for quality vocational education programs in the state.

In order to assume administrative responsibility for vocational education at all levels the State Board will of necessity will have to:

1. Provide overall policymaking, leadership and coordination for vocational education within the state;
2. Receive the reports of State Advisory Councils on vocational education and training and from other states councils, agencies and organizations;
3. Provide a system for distributing funds;
4. Provide a system for accountability and evaluation;
5. Assure equal access to programs;
6. Assist education agencies and institutions in program planning, development and evaluations;
7. Collect and analyze and disseminate information for program planning and operation;
8. Prepare and maintain operational state plans and reports;
9. Assist with and provide for program improvement and support of inservice activities.

These functions will enable the State Board for vocational education to provide and give adequate attention to technical assistance for programs, professional leadership and personnel development, updating the curriculum, maintaining personnel and program standards and coordinating with other state economic development agencies. This will permit the State Board to meet the needs of local and state professionals.

3. New legislation should have a component for skill training and retraining for adults: New legislation should focus on skill training and retraining for adults.

Declining productivity, high unemployment, and a scarcity of qualified skilled workers to meet business and industry needs are having a serious impact on our national economy. Presently there are 10.5 million adults in this nation unemployed, approximately 9.5 percent of the workforce. Our economy is undergoing major structural shifts. New technology must be applied to the workplace. Industries will seek to upgrade their operations. The demographic changes alone are enough to cause great concern.

Yet, other than the Vocational Education Act, there is no significant national policy or training program for adults who wish to train for or retrain to enter the workforce. With existing funds the vocational education programs barely touch the surface of the needs for adult vocational training. New legislation is needed to focus on skilled training and retraining of adults.

AVA recommends that new vocational education legislation contain a new component which would give vocational education the capacity to respond to the growing employment training needs of adults. These needs arise from economic growth and development, reindustrialization, worker displacement and displaced homemakers. The new legislation should enhance the ability of vocational education to do industry specific, customized training and to reestablish the partnership between vocational education and the state employment service. This partnership can go a long way toward helping individuals get employment once trained.

Specifics of AVA recommendations are:

1. There should be a new title in the Vocational Education Act that would fund skilled workforce development activities for adults.

2. The funds should be allocated to states for vocational education utilizing in-place vocational-technical institutions to provide training for adults.

3. Activities eligible to be funded under this new title would be:

Eligible activities:

1. Short-term upgrading, updating and retraining to enable adults to cope and progress as work requirements change;

2. In-plant and/or institution training tailored to the need of an industry or a group of small industries with common needs, including those caused by changing technology and work requirements;

3. Quick-start, customized training for workers in new and expanding industries and for hard-to-fill jobs;

-4. Entrepreneurship training;

5. Linkages between vocational education and other tax-supported occupational training;

6. Skills training and retraining in cooperation with other tax-supported and private sector groups;

7. Employment services planned in conjunction with private employers.

Many of the problems created by demographics and the rapidly changing workplace can be addressed through vocational education programs.

This is demonstrated by many states as they provide a greater emphasis on vocational education as a part of their states economic growth and development activities. They find that their capacity to provide good vocational education training is a plus in community economic development. In some states such as North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma or Georgia the provision of a training program customized to an industry's needs has been an attractive incentive to encouraging industries to expand or to locate new plants in the states.

Customized training programs operate in different ways state to state, but all rely on their permanent vocational education system to carry out the training. This successful approach to helping industries to find the kind of workers they need will be an important strategy in any future national employment training effort and will be one of the reasons for greater attention to adult training and retraining as a part of vocational education.

The Congress is committing billions of dollars over the next few years for the nation's defense. This great increase of funds will demand an influx of skilled people to the workforce. They will be needed to make all the weaponry and to build the ships and aircraft needed by the military. Recently an Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering reported that personnel shortages are a pervasive problem in the United States defense industries. Shortages exist in the number of skilled production workers, machinists, electronics technicians, tool and die makers, test technicians, optical personnel and skilled assemblers the ability of the defense industry to respond to defense needs has deteriorated primarily because of a lack of skilled workers according to the Under Secretary. Many of the defense industries are facing back logs of more than a year at current production levels according to a report of the National Tooling and Machining Association. "Expand the current level of the defense expenditures and the problem will become worse", the Machining Association said. It appears that the time is now to address the need for skilled training for adults.

4. There should continue to be separate and distinct legislation for adult basic education.

The Adult Education Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-750) has as its purpose to: "Expand educational opportunity and encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will enable all adults to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school and make available the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens."

This is a laudable purpose and one that serves the needs of the American people.

Adult basic education should be of such high priority that a federal initiative will be maintained. When 25 percent of the nation's people do not complete high school, it is in the national interest to fund basic literacy programs for those adults after they leave school.

Those who propose to consolidate adult basic education with vocational education fail to understand the purposes of both programs. States do not lack the flexibility to link these programs together as they are now. Approximately one-third of the state administer there programs under some state agency. The question is national

emphasis. In order to maintain this emphasis and national priority, separate legislation is essential.

5. New legislation should provide a uniform definition of postsecondary and adult vocational education. Postsecondary and adult vocational education serves youth and adults after they have completed or left high school.

One of the strengths of any legislation will be its ability to clearly and uniformly define terms, populations served and programs proposed. In job training legislation the terms often lead to confusion because they are designed to satisfy a specific constituent group.

In 1972, Congress coined the phrase Postsecondary Occupational Education and defined it. However, in 1976, as Congress enacted the vocational education amendments, the terms postsecondary and/or adult vocational education were not defined. This has left states with some doubt as to the intent of Congress.

AVA recommends that the terms Postsecondary and Adult Vocational Education be defined as meaning: "Education, training, or retraining (including guidance, counseling, and placement services) for persons sixteen years of age or older who have graduated from or left elementary or secondary school, conducted by an institution legally authorized to provide postsecondary and adult education within a State, which is designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or subprofessionals, or to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced technical education programs, but excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations which require a baccalaureate or advanced degree."

SUMMARY

Throughout the history of Federal involvement in vocational education the Federal role has recognized that vocational education is a program. It can be funded. It is manageable and it is accountable. Federal legislation has recognized that vocational education is the primary responsibility of State and local governments. However, because the institutional setting for vocational education varies from state to state, community to community, legislation has called one state agency or Board to be accountable.

Nationally identified needs and priorities demand an increased interest in adult and postsecondary students, while at the same time assuring a continued strong support for quality secondary programs. Thus there is a need to increase the minimum set-aside for postsecondary and adult programs in the Vocational Education Act. This minimum set-aside should be raised to 30 percent of the basic grant for vocational education.

Above all else, coordinated planning and operation of vocational education programs in a State is essential in order to maintain quality programs. The most effective and efficient means of coordinating these programs is to require states to establish, in accordance with State law, a single State Board that will be responsible for education and training programs. This Board can then assure the Federal Government and the population of a state that there will be non duplication of efforts and link vocational education at all program levels to other State efforts for economic growth and development.

Chairman PERKINS. We will now hear from Diane Lutes, assistant to the chancellor, Illinois Eastern Community College.

We welcome you, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DIANE L. LUTES, ASSISTANT TO THE CHANCELLOR, ILLINOIS EASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Ms. LUTES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. I understand you are from Congressman Simon's district. I regret that he is not here. He is busy elsewhere. He should be right along.

Ms. LUTES. Those of us in Congressman Simon's district appreciate him. We do not mind when he is working.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, on behalf of Illinois Eastern Community College District 529 and Chancellor James S. Spencer, I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to provide testimony on postsecondary vocational education.

My name is Diane L. Lutes. I am the assistant to the chancellor for governmental affairs. Illinois Eastern Community Colleges District 529 is a consortium of four public community colleges located in the southeastern quarter of Illinois, covering 3,000 square miles, encompassing territory in all or parts of 12 counties and serving 21 high school districts.

Illinois Eastern Community Colleges have been in existence and involved in adult employment and training since 1968 and currently offer more than 40 different vocational education and adult employment development and training programs or services.

I turn first to community colleges and vocational education.

In fiscal year 1980, the Federal Government spent \$655 million for vocational education; only \$324 million went to institutions; \$78 million to postsecondary institutions.

Therefore, postsecondary institutions received only 24 percent of the institutional funds and only 12 percent of the total funds while serving over 40 percent of all vocational education students.

In 1978 and 1979, community colleges enrolled approximately two-thirds of the students in postsecondary and adult occupationally specific programs and 33 percent of all such students, including secondary school students.

Based on the above information, the staff of Illinois Eastern Community Colleges believe there are three major points that should be taken into consideration when developing any legislation affecting vocational education or adult employment development and training.

These points are:

One, the adult population is being served primarily through community and technical colleges and enrollments are expected to increase during this decade; two, there is a critical need to expand adult employment development and training significantly in the new and emerging occupational areas in order to improve productivity; and, three, adult training and retraining is necessary for the economic development of the United States and essential for upward occupational mobility of individuals.

I turn now to Illinois community colleges and vocational education.

In 1981, over 50 percent of college level course work in Illinois community colleges was in vocational and technical areas. Illinois community colleges offer 247 discrete occupational and vocational programs.

In our State, our income is derived from student tuition and local, State, and Federal moneys; as is probably true in all States and territories.

Our income is based on production of units of credits—the industrial model. Only 3 percent of this funding comes from the Federal Vocational Education Act moneys.

Of the 825,000 students enrolled in vocational education in Illinois in fiscal year 1981, approximately 40 percent were served by postsecondary institutions and 71 percent of the postsecondary enrollments were served by community colleges.

In order to fulfill our commitment to providing the high quality vocational training needed by industry and the communities in which we are located, community colleges in Illinois have devel-

oped close working relationships with local businesses and industries and have assisted new and expanding business and industries seeking to expand and locate in the community.

Gentlemen, this is not a new issue with us. We have been doing that since our inception.

Most people recognize that high technology is the wave of the future and basic to the economic recovery of our Nation.

While universities are essential to the research and development of high technologies, community and technical colleges are uniquely qualified to train and retrain the Nation's work force in order to implement expanding and new high technologies.

Illinois community colleges have developed programs in such emerging technological areas as laser technology, ultrasonic evaluation, and numerical control, and in such important energy areas as petroleum technology, alcohol fuels production, and mining technology.

Thus, Illinois community colleges are working cooperatively with business and industries, both existing and new to the State, for the economic development of our State.

The community colleges in Illinois plan to maintain and strengthen their commitment to vocational education and the economic development of our State and Nation.

Federal funding has provided the needed impetus to initiate new programs, especially in the more costly technical fields; to refocus existing programs; and to purchase much needed instructional equipment.

As vocational education enrollments both nationally and in Illinois continue to shift from the secondary to the postsecondary level, it is imperative that vocational education funding from all sources shift with the students.

In Illinois, from 1976 to 1981, head count enrollments in vocational education declined by 4 percent at the secondary level, while their vocational education funding increased by 54 percent.

During this same time, head count enrollments in vocational education increased by 147 percent at the postsecondary level, primarily at community colleges, while our vocational education funding increased by only 78 percent.

We believe that the money should more closely follow the students and that the primary responsibility of the public schools is to provide a good general education for our high school graduates.

A good general education is more important today than ever before because the emerging technologies require a higher degree of literacy than many 4-year baccalaureate programs at major universities.

In Illinois, traditional postsecondary education has emphasized the vocational education of the 18- to 24-year-old population for entry level positions in the work force.

Adult education, on the other hand, recognized that, as our society becomes ever more technically oriented, this pretraining or education for entry level positions is not sufficient to maintain a qualified State and national work force.

Education and training must be continuous processes, with workers reenrolling periodically to upgrade their skills in order to assume greater responsibilities, to retrain for emerging new fields

as others become obsolete, and to add skills which may become available in postsecondary curricula but which were not available when many adults attended school the first time.

These two purposes cannot always be accomplished within the same program. Community colleges, both in Illinois and nationally, are uniquely situated in the community to offer both pretraining and retraining programs.

Because both postsecondary and adult vocational programs are growing in size and importance, we strongly urge that the two programs continue to be treated separately, rather than consolidated into one block grant.

Based on the above testimony, the staff of IECC make the following recommendations:

First, the elimination of all set-asides. We strongly urge that the U.S. Congress develop and approve sufficient language to insure that Federal vocational and adult education moneys follow the students.

This reauthorization allowing moneys to follow the students would insure proportionate student/dollar allocations based on available moneys. This is one of the two most important issues the Congress can address in the area of vocational education.

And, we believe that the development of such language will greatly reduce the controversy around the "sole State agency" issue.

The second issue, of equal importance, is the adequate funding of vocational and adult education for our Nation and people.

We suggest that as a minimum the funding for vocational and adult education for fiscal year 1983 should be at the fiscal year 1980 level.

If education is to produce people capable of contributing to the further development of America, the funding for vocational education must be consistent with our national interests.

Third, that prevocational industrial arts programs should not be a fundable activity under the Vocational Education Act. We believe that funding should be limited to occupational specific programs.

Fourth, an example of moneys not following the students is the Ohio Center for Vocational Education. We feel that the Federal Government should attempt to ascertain whether the center is addressing the national needs in vocational education, which is what good vocational education programs should be doing, and what we are doing in community and technical colleges.

Fifth, that existing local accredited institutional training facilities be fully utilized, equipped, supplied, and/or upgraded/remodeled before consideration is given to the development of new facilities.

Sixth, increased support for instructional equipment upgrading and increased support for new instructional equipment for emerging occupations.

Seventh, incentives for program development and improvement in such areas as outreach, weekend colleges, colleges utilizing the facilities of other school systems, employment services, and public and private sector collaboration.

Eighth, support for instructor retraining and upgrading.

And, ninth, that Government programs which are related be required to reinforce each other. We are very pleased that H.R. 5320 does recognize that established accredited training institutions should be used first and that Federal programs should not be used to establish competitive new local programs.

Oftentimes this is a terrible waste of dollars.

We suggest that if the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization Act, H.R. 5540, is passed that as a minimum similar language should be included to address the issue of educational cooperative efforts and linkages.

In closing, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address the committee and to once again strongly stress the importance of full funding for vocational and adult education and the need for this funding to follow the students.

I would now like to end my testimony with the following quote from Thomas Jefferson:

"If a Nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

I would also like to suggest to this committee that you can take the tax cut that was given to me this July and that is proposed for next July, and keep it and put it in programs for our citizens.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you.

We will now hear from Richard Wilson, vice president for Federal relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Welcome; you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD E. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT FOR FEDERAL RELATIONS, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Dr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

My name is Richard Wilson, vice president for Government relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, and the 1,219 community, technical, and junior colleges they represent.

I would first like to give you an overview.

The future of our Nation depends on how fully we utilize our human resources. As our economy becomes more dependent on high technology and the delivery of sophisticated services, the need for better development of our human resources is a necessity.

Only well educated and competently trained people can master the new technologies and specialized services that are increasingly in demand.

The case for better utilization of human resources is clearly made in the AACJC concept paper, "Putting America Back to Work," which is included as a part of our written testimony.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, so ordered.

Dr. WILSON. This paper makes a compelling case for greater investment in human resources. It recommends five principles that should be used in formulating Federal legislation. They are:

One, incentives must be designed to promote greater cooperation between private/governmental employers and existing accredited educational/training institutions for the purpose of preparing citizens for careers of regional and/or national priority.

Two, an administrative structure to allocate Federal resources must be designed in a manner that provides greater State-level flexibility in resource and incentive allocation, and promotes interstate planning for labor market areas that transcend State boundaries.

At the same time, the structure should serve to concentrate the support in the actual training and not in the administrative processes.

Three, incentives must be designed to encourage citizens to seek preparation to qualify for occupations of regional and/or national priority, to be mobile, and to maintain their employment.

Four, a national policy on employment development and training is required.

Five, the currently fragmented authority and accountability for the Federal job training programs must be clarified and unified. It is particularly important to pinpoint responsibility.

The future of vocational education will depend on how well it satisfies the interests and demands of adult students. The demographic data is clear. The school age population—5 to 17—declined 11 percent in the 1970's and another 10-percent decline is forecast for the 1980's.

Recent birth rates, if continued indefinitely, result in a decline of the U.S. population by about 17 percent per generation, given an absence of net immigration.

Unless the birth rate dramatically changes, high school age people, as a proportion of the population, will continue to decline dramatically during the foreseeable future.

Satisfactory treatment of older students provides the only means for insuring the significance and growth of vocational education.

Another significant factor is frequent career changes caused by technological developments and the creation of new markets, products, and services.

Nowadays it is common for individuals to develop, use, and replace career skills three or more times before they eventually retire from full-time employment.

Even then, a growing number of people continue to work on a part-time basis, often in a different field, which creates additional demands for training and educational opportunities.

The consequences of these two dramatic developments—smaller numbers of school-aged people and frequent career changes—is a growing demand for vocational opportunities for adults and a diminishing demand for students in secondary schools.

This is both a threat to established vocational education programs and thinking, and a marvelous opportunity for the creation of more imaginative and effective vocational education programs.

I turn now to community and technical colleges.

Community and technical colleges have been responding in an enthusiastic, creative and constructive way for many years. They specialize in nontraditional students and emphasize preparation for employment.

When asked why they enrolled in community and technical colleges, 80 percent of the students respond: "Ability to get a better job," as the primary reason.

Of the full-time students 52 percent and 93 percent of the part-time students in community and technical colleges are concurrently employed. The average age of their students is approaching 30.

Women students have outnumbered men since 1977 and in 1981 women comprised more than 53 percent of the enrollment. The majority of handicapped students, the majority of minority students, and the majority of students from low-income families enrolled in postsecondary institutions attend community and technical colleges.

There are more than 1,000 community and technical colleges, and they are located in almost every State and major city. Their enrollments continue to grow, increasing almost 2 percent in the fall of 1981, and are approaching 5 million students enrolled in credit courses and an additional 4 million in noncredit courses.

Within the postsecondary sector, community and technical colleges enroll almost all of the vocational students. This is surprising since they constitute only 11 percent of the postsecondary institutions providing vocational education.

Community and technical colleges have long advocated close working relationships with private and public organizations in their communities. This has been especially evident in vocational education.

Most community and technical colleges have general advisory committees that provide direction and counsel on employment, both present and future.

These committees are comprised of representatives of the major community organization in both the private and public sectors. It is the general advisory committee that tries to forecast new career opportunities and employment demands.

When a decision is made to develop a new vocational program, an advisory committee is established specifically for that program.

It assists in deciding which courses should be included, what skills and knowledge need to be learned, and what institutional methods and setting would be most appropriate.

In addition to assisting in curriculum development, they assist by identifying employment opportunities, participating in followup studies to ascertain how well the graduates of the programs are performing on the job, and representing the colleges.

This kind of close collaboration is needed to insure contemporary, effective programs.

I turn now to the purposes of vocational education.

AACJC believes there should be three major purposes of vocational education, purposes that are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they are quite interdependent.

The purposes are: to facilitate economic development, to provide opportunities to learn employability and specific occupational skills, and to provide access to vocational education for all adults.

The greatest asset of any nation is its human resources. Only to the extent its human resources are developed, can a country realize its economic potential.

This requires learning opportunities for all people throughout their lives, not just a chosen few during a limited period of their early lives.

Vocational education can make a major contribution to economic development by reducing unemployment, increasing productivity, and developing human resources.

It is no secret that economic development depends on having a competent well-trained and knowledgeable work force. This has been demonstrated many times at the local and State levels.

An article of faith in this country is that improved productivity is necessary to reduce inflation and further economic development.

Productivity can be improved by utilizing new technologies that reduce dependence on individuals and by having more competent individuals perform the work.

Recent statistics suggest that little has been happening with either of these factors. Vocational education can teach people more efficient ways of accomplishing the same work.

This leads us to the second purpose. Young and older adults need opportunities to learn specific occupational skills and to obtain employability skills, such as work attitudes and habits, information on career opportunities, preparing for job interviews, and completion of applications for employment.

Both of these are essential for people to fully appreciate the job market, make reasonable decisions, and capitalize on them.

For some people their career choices will reveal deficiencies in their basic skills of reading, written expression, and mathematical applications.

Although developmental programs to eliminate these deficiencies are not the responsibility of vocational education, community colleges provide them and thereby make it possible for individuals to prepare themselves for eventual enrollment in the occupational programs they select.

The third purpose is to insure access to vocational education programs for all individuals. It was previously noted in the introductory section of this paper that community and technical colleges already set an excellent example by enrolling more minority students, students from low income families, and handicapped students than any other sector of postsecondary education.

Furthermore, more than 53 percent of their students are women. This has heightened their sensitivity to sexual discrimination and sex stereotyping and encouraged them to make greater efforts to eliminate these problems.

Community and technical colleges have always prided themselves on their accessibility, calling themselves "open door" colleges.

They attempt to be more accessible by establishing outreach centers, keeping costs as low as possible, and offering courses at times convenient for all residents in their communities.

I turn now to the recommendations of AACJC.

The first is equitable treatment of community and technical colleges. Presidents and directors of occupational programs at some

community and technical colleges strongly criticize the administration of vocational education.

They assert that they are not receiving a fair share of the Federal resources and that despite the fact they are enrolling a growing proportion of the students, they are still receiving a relatively small amount of the dollars.

They believe the only equitable division is for the dollars to follow the students on the basis of hours of instruction.

Some even question if the 15-percent set-aside is actually spent on postsecondary and adult education. This is hard to document because some secondary schools provide adult education.

They also believe community and technical colleges will continue to attract increasing shares of the vocational enrollment because the only potential population for real growth is older adults, a population with which they are working more effectively than any other sector of education.

Although there is no agreement on the proportion of dollars that should be awarded to postsecondary institutions, not less than 40 percent is a conservative figure.

Enrollment data collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics in 1979-80 reveal that 39 percent of all students in vocational education programs were enrolled in postsecondary programs.

Restricting the analysis to only those students enrolled in occupationally specific programs, which excludes general vocational education programs, 51 percent of the students are enrolled in postsecondary programs.

Given the two factors mentioned earlier, demographic statistics and the necessity of older adults to change careers several times during their working lives, the proportion of people enrolled in postsecondary and adult programs will undoubtedly increase.

Given these facts and trends, a reasonable distribution would be no less than half for postsecondary programs.

Second, remove sole State agency requirements. Community and technical colleges are opposed to Federal laws dictating the structure of State administration.

Present law dictates structure and the results are quite uneven.

The removal of the sole State agency requirement provides more flexibility and allows postsecondary and secondary schools to work at the State level to revolve their problems by changing State administrative structures, if necessary.

This opportunity is denied by the current Vocational Education Act.

Third, reduced Federal prescriptiveness. The current Vocational Education Act, and the regulations derived from it, are far too prescriptive.

Community and technical colleges attempt to be sensitive and responsive to community needs. This is especially crucial when discussions are underway with a major firm regarding the location of a new facility or expansion of an existing enterprise.

Representatives of both private and public organizations must have prompt, firm answers to their questions about the development and implementation of new occupational programs.

Lengthy reports, voluminous paperwork, protracted review processes, and other requirements imposed by State and Federal agencies make it difficult, sometimes impossible, to give definitive answers within the available time.

Fourth, reduced VEDS reporting requirements. VEDS has been a major problem for community and technical colleges the past 3 years.

It is a poorly designed system that includes many data inconsistencies which make it impossible to draw any useful conclusions.

The costs are extraordinarily high and the value has yet to be demonstrated. Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, information solicited through the HEGIS surveys should be sufficient.

Fifth, increased Federal appropriations. I join with my colleagues at the table. I think we are all saying this very clearly.

The demand for vocational education opportunities continues to grow among the adult population, the cost of effective programs is increasing dramatically, and the Federal appropriations have actually diminished insofar as purchasing power is concerned.

All of these factors make it obvious that greatly increased appropriations are needed. It should also be pointed out that billions of dollars are needed to bring occupational laboratory equipment and materials up to the state of the art and to provide opportunities for faculty members to bring their own skills and knowledge up-to-date.

Sixth, incentives to expand opportunities for vocational education. Community and technical colleges are establishing outreach centers, lengthening their working days, operating weekend colleges, and utilizing the facilities of other school systems, private industry, and public agencies to offer educational programs throughout their communities.

Although developing and administering these arrangements can be time consuming and costly, it is much less expensive than forming new organizations or building new facilities.

Since community and technical colleges are already serving large numbers of people from historically underserved populations, financial incentives to strengthen their work and further their efforts would be an excellent investment.

Finally, incentives to collaborate with private and public sector employers. Some educational institutions are still criticized, and justifiably so, for being removed from the "real world."

Some efforts to better integrate the worlds of work and education are succeeding. An example is cooperative education.

Although it has not become as popular and widespread as it should be, community and technical colleges have created variations of cooperative education which have made it much more popular and practical.

Other means of collaborating should be implemented, such as arranging more "clinical experiences" for students in actual work settings.

Directors of nursing programs require the use of hospitals as clinical settings for their nursing candidates. This pattern should be followed in other occupational programs.

Closer collaboration between educational institutions and employers will also lead to more realistic and timely responses to employment demands.

In conclusion, vocational education is not an expenditure. It is an investment. The economic development of the country requires vocational educational opportunities for adults—not just one opportunity but continuing opportunities throughout their lives as they change careers to match technological and economic changes.

Vocational education must also change with the times.

Thank you.

[Information submitted for the record follows:]

PUTTING AMERICA BACK TO WORK

A CONCEPT PAPER

Developed by the
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges

in cooperation with the
Association of Community College Trustees



American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050
March 26, 1982

A Compelling National Interest

How can we evaluate a good society; by our cars, our refrigerators, our computers? History will gauge our society primarily by what we do with our human resources... and our human values. If we do not know how to seek the best in our people—fully utilize our human resources—then we become a wasteful society regardless of what we do elsewhere. Our nation is experiencing a sense of ennui... that whatever we do just will not make much difference. Declining productivity, unemployment and underemployment, stagflation and inflation, high interest rates, and federal deficits have become battering rams causing a staggering impact upon our nation.

The mobilization of our human resources offers a way out. We can make a difference. How can this nation ever be complacent about the waste of human resources? Our country desperately requires a bold new approach to human resource development. That new approach must be equivalent to the commitment that landed a man on the moon. Our "moon-shot" for the 1980's must be aimed at the triple goals of ample employment opportunities, increased productivity, and economic health for the individual and our country. We must rise above the way things have always been done and search for new approaches and new combinations of resources.

This new "moon-shot" will require a consensus among our elected national leaders that results in the establishment of priorities, detailed planning, a coordinated national approach, and the full use of public and private resources accompanied by adequate state and federal funding. It is a cruel deception to delude ourselves into thinking this national effort will happen by chance. Surely, the spaceship Apollo would still be a sketch on the drawing board without the concerted commitment of national leaders and national resources. In this time of scarce fiscal resources we must focus our effort and carefully coordinate the use of our dollars.

*Our country desperately
requires a bold new
approach to human
resource development.*

Why Compelling?

Why is society's compelling interest in job development and training a national interest? There are several answers to this question:

1. Employment pays taxes; and unemployment drains taxes. High national unemployment causes federal and state expenditures for welfare to climb while tax receipts decline. Concentrations of unemployment, such as those in the auto and lumber industries, have a dramatic economic impact on the rest of the country.
2. The issue of declining productivity is closely interrelated with national fiscal, monetary, and human resource policies. In addition, international trade demands a productive work force if we are to compete vigorously, and complete the cycle from new technology to reduced prices to higher quality.
3. Unemployment, particularly in urban areas, presents a tremendous problem to state and local governments, one that they are frequently ill-equipped to solve. In this highly mobile society these problems tend to spill across the country.
4. Employment opportunities do not start or stop at state lines. Shortages of skilled workers remain a national problem and will seriously dampen economic revitalization efforts.
5. The defense of our country rests upon well-educated personnel and adequately trained technicians. A projected five-year \$1.4 trillion investment in sophisticated machinery and weapons proposed to maintain and upgrade our national defense will be meaningless without trained personnel to build and operate this equipment.
6. The country is just too interdependent for any sector to be required to go it alone. State and local governments, plus a highly diverse private sector, cannot be expected to operate in a policy vacuum and must have national leadership.
7. The economic health of our nation requires a well-trained and productive work force.

A healthy economy requires a national investment in job development and training that will put America back to work.

Some History

A healthy economy requires a national investment in job development and training that will put America back to work. Historically, our country's strength reflects an unflagging investment in the human potential. The unassailable lesson of the G.I. Bill is applicable here. Any new vision to revitalize the economy must start with our human resources.

America's colleges and universities have played a major part in developing and defending the nation. Their importance was recognized long ago by the federal government.

- The Morrill Act of 1862 provided the basis for land grant colleges, which have prepared millions of people for professional and technical work, trained thousands for the Armed Forces and, through research, added immensely to our scientific, technological, and economic development. The realized goal of making two blades of grass grow where one has grown before has made this nation the most productive agricultural land in the world.
- The Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 initiated federal support to foster vocational education. The federal-state-local partnership has been the key to the proven success of the time-honored vocational education program. State and local dollars have supported the daily operation and federal dollars have enabled schools and colleges to secure new equipment, cover the exceptional costs of certain vocational programs, and provide the extra support required to help special populations. Without federal funding, the poorest states will have the most difficulty providing first-rate vocational education and adult employment development and training opportunities.
- The G. I. Bill of 1944 clearly demonstrated that federal investment in people can pay incalculable dividends to the nation. Since the enactment of the first G. I. Bill, more than 18 million veterans have received educational benefits and, through the taxes they've paid, repaid the government several times over for those benefits. The G. I. Bill provided unheard of access, across the country, to thousands of public and private colleges and universities.

Missing Link

The missing link in all of this is the lack of a national policy on employment development and training. We have a foreign policy, a monetary policy, a fiscal policy, but no national policy spelling out a long range plan to utilize wisely our most precious resource—the human resource. This lack of a coherent, systematic national framework policy is best evidenced by the fragmented training programs that can be found throughout the federal government. Nearly all federal Cabinet-level secretaries administer some kind of employment development and training program funds. Rarely is there coordination among their programs.

Add to this federal fragmentation the plethora of job programs sponsored by state and local governments, and, of course, all of the programs operated by the private sector. The picture cries out for a national framework policy. Amid such fragmentation and duplication our slumping productivity is hardly surprising.

Moving America again to the forefront of global competition is essentially a challenge in skill development of keeping our work force as advanced as our technology. It is a compelling national challenge. The challenge cannot be met alone by piecemeal responses, state by state, town by town. Orchestration of policy and resources, public and private, at every level of our system, is required, starting with a cohesive national policy formulated by the Congress that requires financial efficiency, program effectiveness, and institutional accountability.

The missing link in all of this is the lack of a national policy on employment development and training.

What Is the Current Situation?

The problems America's economy faces are not Republican problems or Democratic problems; they are American problems. We are bridled with chronic unemployment and underemployment, sagging productivity, high interest rates, and recurring cycles of stagflation and inflation. Moreover, we are facing a severe shortage of skilled workers, which promises to worsen in the future if we do not reverse it. Finally, a projected \$1.4 trillion defense investment in sophisticated machinery and weapons proposed to maintain and upgrade our national defense will be meaningless without trained people to build and operate this equipment.

Unemployment

Today almost 10 million Americans are on record as unemployed. In addition, many individuals have simply given up in the search for work and have sunk below the statistical level.

Underemployment

Underemployment continues as well. In *A Fisherman's Guide: An Assessment of Training and Remediation Strategies*, author Robert Taggart writes: "There were 5.5 million individuals in the labor force 50 weeks or more in 1980 whose employment and earnings problems were so serious that their families were below the poverty level. There were 15 million who did not earn the equivalent of the minimum wage for the hours and weeks each was willing and able to work."

Skilled Worker Shortages

Ironically, at a time when we are experiencing high levels of unemployment, nearly every trade association in this country reports skilled craftsman shortages—shortages that will increase to dangerous levels if solutions are not applied soon. For example, the 1981 survey of the American Electronics Association documents a growing demand for technicians in electronics and computer sciences. The survey shows a need for 140,000 new technical paraprofessionals by 1985. Most of these positions will be created by the young, developing companies, companies that do not and cannot afford to develop and offer their own training programs.

Business Leaders Concerned

Business leaders recognize that some national action is required. As the so-called "Reaganomics" is being tested, some business leaders are warning that the economy could face serious additional difficulties if the federal government reduces its responsibility for educating, training, and improving the work force. The prestigious Business Roundtable has called for a national policy to deal with a growing imbalance between the supply of workers and the skills demanded.

Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity in June of 1981, B. F. Metier, Chairman of TRW, Inc., called for a national public-private effort to address the problems of structural unemployment. Metier expressed the feeling that our nation has skimped on its investment in employee development and training.

Defense Concerns

A strong defense is another national challenge. The Armed Forces lack sufficient numbers of trained technicians and professionals to staff existing equipment. They face a serious shortage of technicians to build, operate, and repair the coming weapons systems.

The problems America's economy faces are not Republican problems or Democratic problems; they are American problems.

In a recent paper prepared for the National Council on Employment Policy, economist Isabel Sawhill of the Urban Institute offers the military as a prime example of the problems that may occur when capital equipment becomes more sophisticated than the available work force. She suggests that in this case "buying more hardware does not look like a very good investment unless accompanied by a major effort to upgrade the skills of those who will have to use it." She recommends that, as the Administration makes plans to double its spending for defense, it consider making this sector a laboratory for the development of new education and training systems with possible "spill-overs for the civilian sector."

Fragmentation

There are a multitude of reasons why an individual may be unable to find employment, i.e., physical and mental handicaps, learning barriers, lack of technical skills, criminal records, workers in declining industries, limited English speaking, displaced homemakers. The governmental services aimed at helping these individuals are fragmented and dispersed. There is no unified "evaluation and referral" system required. Compounding this fragmentation of services are conflicting program requirements. As an example, in many states, individuals receiving unemployment insurance compensation cannot enroll in a full-time training program without losing benefits, because the individual must supposedly be ready to accept any appropriate job offer. None of the programs address the need to continually upgrade the productivity of employed workers to ensure a technically competent work force.

Work Force Needs

Paradoxically, we are moving from a baby boom to a baby bust period. A severe overall worker shortage is predicted within the decade.

In the 1970's the growth rate of the American work force averaged 2.45 percent, in the 1980's it will be between 1.25 and 1.5 percent, and in the 1990's it will be less than one percent per year. There is little elasticity remaining in our population since 52 percent of the women and 78 percent of the men of working age are already employed. The agricultural sector is operating with a minimum of people (three percent of the work force), and the manufacturing sector is quickly reducing employment with the aid of robotics and computer-aided manufacturing. To maintain a strong work force will require better retraining opportunities for employees who want to work part-time, as well as full-time, to learn new skills and acquire new knowledge.

Community, Technical, Junior Colleges: A Uniquely American Resource

Community, technical, and junior colleges constitute a rapidly growing sector of postsecondary education. Some 1,231 community, technical, and junior colleges across America enrolled in the fall of 1981 an estimated five million students for regular credit, and another five million students in non-credit courses. During the 1981-82 college year it is anticipated that over 11 million different individuals will take one or more classes at a community, technical, or junior college. When fully utilized as a major national resource in the adult job development and training field, these colleges can and do:

1. Prepare technicians and skilled workers for specific occupations, including defense-related occupations.

A severe overall worker shortage is predicted within the decade.

2. Provide literacy training, upward mobility, and retraining opportunities for employees particularly aimed at skilled worker shortages.
3. Assist owners and operators of small businesses.
4. Promote local collaboration among labor, education, and business organizations, particularly cooperative efforts with Private Industry Councils.
5. Cooperate in productivity studies and work force planning.
6. Assist in the development and operation of Urban Enterprise Zones.
7. Participate in statewide economic development and reindustrialization strategies.

Our nation's public and private schools and colleges form the most comprehensive system of education and training in the world. They have served the nation well in the past and can serve it even better in the future.

Postsecondary institutions are particularly qualified to help address national economic problems, enhance the abilities of individuals, improve the quality of personal lives, and build the strength of our nation. American postsecondary education institutions can and must be better utilized in the solving of the problems of employment development and training.

Colleges also must never forget that their roots are in high schools. It does little good for college personnel to carp about poorly prepared students unless they are reaching out to help their high schools. College personnel must form, with the secondary schools in their service regions, deep linkages that will produce both strong school career and vocational education programs and higher academic performance.

Here are some special program targets for inclusion in any new adult employment development and training legislation:

• Specific Job Training

The need for *occupationally specific training* is not limited to young people preparing for their first jobs. Employed individuals increasingly require opportunities to upgrade their skills and to learn new skills as revolutionary shifts occur in employment demands. For example, the demand for white collar and service workers is increasing while blue collar and manufacturing jobs are decreasing. Peter Drucker predicts that manufacturing jobs will constitute less than five percent of the American work force in 25 years. In the 1950's 41 percent of the work force was in this sector. Today it is only 27 percent. The quality of workers' performances is critical in these new jobs, and that depends on how well they have learned and can use the skills they were taught.

Education and training programs must provide incentives to encourage workers to acquire new, higher level skills—especially skills that would enable them to work in *high technology* and skill areas that will be most critical to our nation's well-being in the future. Such incentives will help reduce the number of workers who are displaced, underemployed, or unemployed.

Colleges . . . have served the nation well in the past and can serve it even better in the future.

• Skilled Worker Shortages

Special attention must be given to the current and predicted *skill shortage areas* of employment opportunities, particularly in high technology occupations. For example, the American Electronics Association report that reveals 140,000 technicians are needed during the next five years includes such fields as computer analysts, programmers, computer software engineers, and electronic engineer technologists. The health care industry reports a growing shortage of nurses and medical technologists in numerous specialized fields.

• Entrepreneurship: One Answer for Unemployment

The drive to achieve economic self-sufficiency through *small business ownership* has not slackened; in fact, it continues to intensify, showing that the traditional American spirit of individual initiative is entirely alive. More than 500,000 new small businesses are launched each year. Our increasingly service-related economy offers a growing spectrum of opportunities for customized and personalized small businesses. Today, one job opening in four and almost all of the new jobs are found in a company with fewer than 200 employees and a gross profit of less than \$1 million annually. If each small business in the country could have one new employee, the unemployment problem of the country would vanish.

• Proven Partners

Most community colleges routinely promote *collaboration with local businesses and labor unions*. Many of them came into being through local initiatives headed by business and labor leaders. It is standard operating procedure for a community college to have local advisory committees of employers, employees, and practitioners for each of its occupational programs. A study by AACJC revealed the average community, technical, and junior college has nearly 100 specific working arrangements with local organizations. The larger number by far is with local businesses. All of this experience by community colleges in facilitating cooperative arrangements must be used to increase productivity and economic development.

Colleges can make an important contribution to the enterprise zones by offering low-cost customized training programs.

• Urban Enterprise Zones

It is the objective of the *Urban Job and Enterprise Zone* proposals to encourage local governments and small businesses to work together to facilitate the employment of the poor. New businesses would be lured to depressed urban and rural areas with lower taxes and reduced government regulation. It is proposed that ten to twenty-five enterprise zones be created each year for a three-year period. Community, technical, and junior colleges can make an important contribution to the enterprise zones by offering low-cost customized training programs. The presence of a comprehensive community college system should be considered in the designation of such zones.

• Productivity

Productivity studies and work force planning efforts that fail to take into account the major training institutions and programs fall short of the mark. Efforts to improve productivity require the cooperation of all the partners in the enterprise, i.e., employers, employees, and training or retraining programs. Some states are carefully orchestrating economic development policies fully utilizing the resources of the two-year colleges.

Proposal for a New "Moon-Shot" Commitment

The current federal initiatives in human resource development are embodied in a diversity of programs including: CETA, Adult Basic Education, Vocational Education Act, various student financial aid programs, and defense training programs. What is clearly required is an examination of these programs with a new "moon-shot" commitment to foster job development and training relevant to economic development.

Existing legislation must be reviewed for possible refinement and new legislation initiated which addresses the following five principles:

1. *Incentives must be designed to promote greater cooperation between private/governmental employers and existing accredited educational/training institutions for the purpose of preparing citizens for careers of regional and/or national priority.*

We recommend that incentives (direct federal funding, matching support, and/or tax relief) be developed to:

- Provide for the enhancement of relevant education/training services in accredited postsecondary institutions through increased private sector support for instructional staff upgrading, curriculum development, equipment and facility upgrading, and cooperative training relationships.

- Encourage greater private sector support for training activities of national priority which will facilitate worker mobility.

2. *An administrative structure to allocate federal resources must be designed in a manner that provides greater state level determination of resource and/or incentive allocation, and promotes interstate planning for labor market areas that transcend state boundaries.*

We recommend that guidelines for the states:

- Provide a strong role for employers and labor leaders to work with state government leaders in allocation decisions and the establishment of state job development and training priorities, and
- Provide for representatives of community, technical, and junior colleges along with other vocational education representatives to have a formal advisory role in state and local allocation decisions and the establishment of job development and training services, and
- Provide guidelines for the allocation of funds or other incentives such that the needs of disadvantaged, handicapped, minorities, and other special populations will be addressed, and national skill shortage priorities will be addressed, and
- Provide a mechanism for interstate collaboration in addressing the economic development and job training needs of such economic regions as the Pittsburgh-Wheeling-Cleveland-Detroit reindustrialization corridor.

Existing legislation must be reviewed for possible refinement and new legislation initiated . . .

3. *Incentives must be designed to encourage citizens to seek preparation to qualify for occupations of regional and/or national priority, to be mobile, and to maintain their employment.*

We recommend the establishment of:

- Target grants, loans, tax relief to support education/training costs for occupations of national or regional priority, and
 - Regulations that make it economically advantageous for individuals to seek and accept employment and training opportunities, as opposed to reliance upon subsistence stipends, and
 - A voucher retraining approach along with unemployment insurance.
4. *A national policy on employment development and training is required.*

We recommend that such a policy include:

- The integration of all training and vocational education legislation into a cohesive national human resource development program.
 - The role that community, technical, and junior colleges can play in this vital process along with other educational and training organizations.
 - Pinpointing accountability for worker assessments and the operation of the evaluation, referral, and placement system.
5. *The currently fragmented authority and accountability for the federal job training programs must be clarified and unified. It is particularly important to pinpoint responsibility.*

We recommend:

- The establishment of a federal Board for Employment Development and Training to serve as the coordinating and rule/regulation developing body to implement the policies established by Congress. Such a Board might be composed of the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Education, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Commerce should be named Chairman of this Board and provide the staff work required to ensure that the national employment development and training policy will serve to promote the commerce of the United States.

National leadership and a national policy framework are required if the new "moon-shot" is to move from the launching pad.

In summary, the nation's 1,231 two-year postsecondary institutions stand prepared to make a major contribution to training and retraining large segments of the nation's work force to meet the triple goals of high employment, increased productivity, and economic health. However, national leadership and a national policy framework are required if the new "moon-shot" is to move from the launching pad.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

This concept paper was developed by a special Task Force to underscore the importance of human resource development in the economic life of this nation, and to present a proposal for improving adult employment development and training.

Task Force Members

Task Force:

Chairman: Dale Parnell, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Vice Chairman: Nolan Ellason, Chancellor, Cuyahoga Community College District, Ohio

Arthur Avila, President, East Los Angeles Community College, California

Dwight Davis, Director, North Central Technical Institute, Wisconsin

Carol Ellason, Director, National Small Business Training Network, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Don Garrison, President, Tri-County Technical College, South Carolina

Andy Korim, Dean, Grants Management and Development, Community College of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

Pattie Powell, Chairman, Association of Community College Trustees Committee on Federal Relations, and Trustee, Dallas County Community College District, Texas

George Rodda, Trustee, Coast Community College District, California

Ex Officio:

Ron Mears, President, Association of Community College Trustees Board of Directors, and Trustee, Kansas City, Kansas, Community College

William Mearby, Executive Director, Association of Community College Trustees, Washington, D.C.

Joe Rushing, Chairman, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Board of Directors, and Chancellor, Tarrant County Junior College, Texas

Consulting Economist:

Herbert E. Striner, Professor and former Dean of the Nogod College of Business Administration, The American University, Washington, D.C.

Staff:

Richard Wilson, Vice President for Governmental Relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Paula Brown, Assistant for Governmental Relations, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Frank Menzel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Association of Community College Trustees, Washington, D.C.

For further information contact:

Dale Parnell, President
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W., #410
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Let me ask the entire panel a question and we will start with you, Dr. Rowlett.

I would like to get each of your reactions to the administration's proposal to consolidate the vocational education and adult education programs into a block grant.

This would cut the funding by 32 percent.

What impact do you feel this legislation would have on post-secondary education, assuming that the present recommendation is put in effect?

Dr. ROWLETT. This does not make any sense at all on two counts.

First of all, it seems to me as a matter of national policy, that it is in the public interest that the Congress establish priorities that relate to the funding of programs to prepare people for the workforce of this Nation.

Moving it to a block grant program and giving complete latitude to local communities to use Federal dollars will not necessarily address national priorities.

We train people for jobs other than just at a local county or a local State. Our people are mobile. They need to be able to develop skills and knowledge that are transportable all over this great country of ours.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I do not fathom the logic of these days and times—or any time for that matter—of reducing appropriations for vocational education.

Chairman PERKINS. Dr. Wilson?

Dr. WILSON. Our association is opposed to the block grant concept. We do not see any value to it. What we do see is an effort to reduce the amount of money to two very important areas of adult education and vocational education.

So, unless someone can persuade us that there is a real advantage to this and it is not just a device to reduce appropriations, then we will be opposed to it.

Chairman PERKINS. Ms. Lutes?

Ms. LUTES. We are opposed to it, as we stated earlier. Now is not the time to be reducing moneys to vocational and adult education.

As we stated in our testimony, we feel that vocational and adult education right now serves two very important segments of our population.

In addition, just to give you a little explanation as to how we get our moneys in Illinois, we get credit-hour grants. Between last year and this year, depending on what our Governor does, we are going to lose somewhere between \$1 to \$4 a credit-hour.

That means that our income from last year to this year is going to be decreased that much, but our enrollments are increasing.

In the area of vocational education with the cost of the equipment and the emphasis on emerging technologies, there is no way that you can expect the educational institutions of this country to develop a productive work force when our funding is continually being cut off.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Mills?

Mr. MILLS. Having full responsibility for both vocational and adult education in Florida, I think it is bad.

No. 1, I looked at the folding in of block grants in community school education with title I. As a result, when you begin to look at priorities, we find that we do not have the money for the community schools. It becomes the low man on the totem pole.

I think if you put these programs in competition for dollars through the block grant, you are going to have various problems with that.

I, like the rest of these people, feel it is very unwise. I personally am totally against the concept of a block grant.

I think you have been right from the very beginning on identifying goals in places you want things done. You have placed the dollars there to do it.

So, a block grant to me is like putting the money on the stump and running. We sometimes talk about it like that in Florida. I do not think we ought to do that. I think we need some degree of control of the program.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to get a reauthorization bill out as rapidly as possible. I would like to get it out this year, but I am waiting to see what happens here in the next 4 or 5 weeks.

I do not think the congressional climate can get any worse in the future. I think it will improve considerably.

Dr. Rowlett, you suggested that the set-aside for post, secondary and adult basic education should be increased. I would like to hear all of you comment on that and how much you think this set-aside should be increased.

I personally feel there should be an increase to some degree. I do not know where we should draw the line.

I think you may want to see us move a bill as soon as possible.

However, I am afraid we have some people in the U.S. Senate who know very little about training programs. I am not going to swap my judgment and my experience in this field for anybody else's, until I can see a way clear. I want to have a piece of legislation that will improve vocational programs, instead of having our authorization cut to pieces. That disturbs me an awful lot.

Go ahead and tell us to what extent you feel the set-aside should be increased.

Dr. ROWLETT. My own personal feelings would be somewhere in the range of 25 to 30 percent.

I believe it would take at least this level to approach any modicum of equity for the kinds of programs that operate throughout this country.

Chairman PERKINS. Dr. Wilson?

Dr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, from our standpoint the set-aside has not really proven to be the best way of doing business. We would prefer to have the money follow the students.

Based on the most recent data collected by NCES, at least 40 percent of those students are in postsecondary institutions.

If we disregard the general vocational education and focus only on the occupational specific, then more than half of those students are in postsecondary institutions.

Secondly, I would agree with AVA that there should be a uniform definition. There is confusion right now because we have lumped together that.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you have evidence where the States have put all the money in adult education instead of post secondary? They have never done that to my knowledge; have they?

Dr. WILSON. We have complaints from South Carolina and Massachusetts that the postsecondary institutions do not receive the 15 percent.

But the wild card here is the definition of adult and postsecondary. The fact is there are many adult programs offered by postsecondary institutions.

So it is well within the law. In some States there is zero money going to postsecondary institutions and they invest the full 15 percent, plus more dollars, in adults in the secondary schools.

Chairman PERKINS. I will let my staff average that out and work on that. [Laughter.]

Chairman PERKINS. Ms. Lutes?

Ms. LUTES. I have to agree with Dick Wilson. Our position is that we should be fair to everybody. Most importantly, it is the fairest to the students and it is the fairest to our country.

Let the dollar follow the students. If we do that, then no one will be able to argue about the State agency because it will already be decided.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erdahl?

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

That is one of the questions and comments in your testimony that I had underscored. If you could be more specific as to how this should be done, I would like to hear it.

Should we have a perstudent figure that should be allocated regardless of who wants to go to school?

I am also curious as to how administration of this course can best be accomplished if it were pursued.

Dr. WILSON. I will try to answer that.

Mr. ERDAHL. I regret that I was across the hall in another committee meeting during part of your testimony. I apologize for walking out when you were making it. But if you would respond, I would appreciate it.

Dr. WILSON. Our answer is that just as in the current law, there is a formula for allocating the money to the States. Once the money has been allocated to the States within those States, then the money is allocated on the basis of student enrollment in vocational programs.

As to how that is defined—and there are two obvious ways. One is with all vocational programs and the other is just to focus on the occupation specific. That is not the question.

But just as the States do allocate the money based on enrollments, that is, they allocate their own dollars, then why could not the Federal dollars be allocated the very same way?

Mr. ERDAHL. Ms. Lutes, do you care to respond to that?

Ms. LUTES, you triggered my question. Would you care to respond to the mechanism or the avenue with that concept of following the students? Could it be done?

Ms. LUTES. I have to go back to how income is generated for community colleges in Illinois. It is a formula. All of you have developed a formula for moneys going to the States.

Our State has developed a formula as to how we are funded. I do not see that it would be extremely difficult for the State of Illinois—or any State in this country—to sit down and develop a formula for distribution of those dollars.

Mr. ERDAHL. I would like the chairman to yield for a further question.

Chairman PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. ERDAHL. How would that be done mechanically? What if we would do away with the concept of a sole State agency? Would that not make administrative difficulties if that were approved?

We could bypass the State and go directly from the Federal Government.

Ms. LUTES. That might not always be bad.

Let me put it to you this way. It is our position that if the dollars are allowed to follow the students, and if a fair formula is developed, then the problem of a sole State agency I do not think would be controversial.

It appears that the controversy around the sole State agency issue right now is that many people feel they are not being treated fairly.

I think once a formula is developed for the distribution of the funds proportionately to where the students are, then I do not think anyone is going to be quite as upset about who actually administers the funds.

All of you have decided that the dollars will follow the students.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS. I am a little confused on the issue because I thought we were working on formulas. Our State plan has a formula for every blessed thing we have in the distribution of money.

I think we have some very succinct rules to tell us what we are supposed to do in terms of developing that.

Chairman PERKINS. We are going to get a breakdown. We will see how much has been spent for postsecondary and adult. We will get a breakdown for all the States.

Mr. MILLS. I believe that the AVA position has been stated that it should be 30 percent. That is after great consultation with a great number of people in the field.

But we also feel very strongly that there ought to be an additional title today in adult education because of the tremendous increased demand we have in reindustrialization and working with the displaced homemakers.

We did a survey, sir, and made an announcement in the newspaper in the State of Florida in three locations asking for people who wanted to go back into the work force who had skills.

Quite frankly, we are going to put out a computer printout in the industry within the State that we have quite a few folks out there who want to get back to work with some of the complications they have.

But in terms of your question, sir, we have said in our paper that 30 percent was the figure that we thought we should go to.

We thought we ought to have an additional title defining this.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me pose another question to all of you.

In your State, Mr. Mills, what agency has been designated the single State agency for vocational education?

Tell us if that agency is different from the one that has responsibility for higher education programs. Has your State had any problems with the provisions in the law requiring consultation with the other State agencies in the planning process?

Go ahead and comment.

Mr. MILLS. The single State agency is the State board of education, chaired by the Governor of the State and other members of the cabinet.

Under this structure, the commissioner of education is a member of that cabinet. He is an elected official. The organization of the department of education acts as a single State agency.

It is such that we have four major divisions, one for public schools administration; one for community college administration; one for the university, that is, the board of regents; and the programmatic division which I represent, for vocational education.

We coordinate for the State all vocational programs across-the-board for the State board of education. It has worked slicker than a whistle. It is a beautiful setup in terms of that.

We all set on the same staff. If there are questions to be covered, then we cover those questions. So, I could not recognize this as a problem in any way, shape, or form so far as the service to the State is concerned and in terms of equal distribution of resources.

That is my response.

Chairman PERKINS. Ms. Lutes?

Ms. LUTES. In Illinois, the money is handled by our State board of education which is separate from our board of higher education and our community college board.

It is fairly obvious from my testimony that it has not been an equitable distribution of moneys.

I personally do not spend a lot of time with the State board of education. I would be happy to return and discuss this with my chancellor and send you a letter on the inner workings of the State board and the cooperation.

Mr. CRAIG. Would the Chairman yield?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. CRAIG. Ms. Lutes, in relation to your concern for lack of equity, is that a problem with Federal law or is it a problem inside your State?

Ms. LUTES. I think that all dollars have to be distributed where the students are.

Mr. CRAIG. My point is this. Is that a problem in the current Federal law or is it a problem in your State? Is it a determination at the State level versus the Federal level?

Ms. LUTES. Well, when you have a 15-percent set-aside as a minimum which will go to postsecondary education rather than a set-aside of 40 percent, or whatever it is, of the students that are actually attending postsecondary education, then you leave it to the discretion of the States as to whether or not they will spend more or less than that 15 percent, that is, more than that 15 percent of the Federal dollar on postsecondary vocational education.

So, I think it is complicated: The answer is yes in both places. There is a problem there.

Mr. CRAIG. But we are mandating a minimum.

Ms. LUTES. I know.

Mr. CRAIG. Do you not think that States ought to have the flexibility to make the determination as to where the dollars are to flow following the minimum requirement?

Ms. LUTES. If you want my honest answer, I would say no.

Mr. CRAIG. You want the Federal Government to dictate to the State as to how they will run their educational programs beyond certain limits?

Ms. LUTES. What I am suggesting is that the Federal Government could initiate such language that would insure that the dollars go where the students are.

If that means Federal regulations to get that done, then my position is yes, I would strongly suggest that.

I think, as you can see from Mr. Wilson's testimony, as well as mine, that all of the States have not been doing maybe the best job they could.

That is not saying that all States are not doing the best job they could.

However, certainly the State of Illinois, where we are training 40 percent of the adult vocational students, we are not getting the same proportion of the money.

There is something wrong when that is happening.

Mr. CRAIG. That is why I asked you: Is it wrong here or is it wrong out in your State?

Ms. LUTES. I think it is wrong in both places. It would behoove the Federal Government and this committee to initiate such language that would insure that the Federal dollars go where the students are.

The States have some match on that. You are leading them down the right path in doing that.

Yes, the State has some problems with that, as well.

As a citizen of this country, I look oftentimes for the Federal Government to take the lead in doing the right things, rather than sometimes when we are in the States and we are closer to a lot of the pressures which will come to bear on people, then we act that way.

This is one of the areas where the Federal Government has got to be a leader and not a follower.

Chairman PERKINS. Excuse me, Mr. Craig.

We will have to recess briefly. We will be right back after a vote on the floor of the House.

[Recess taken.]

Mr. KILDEE (Acting Chairman). Let us resume.

In April, the unemployment rate in my home city of Flint, Mich., reached 26.4 percent, which is the highest I have seen in my lifetime.

Could you summarize how the Federal Government might enhance the role of postsecondary education in assisting unemployed workers in these desperate times?

What I have in mind is this. Flint's local community college, is doing a tremendous job in vocational training, but in certain training areas they have reached capacity and cannot serve any more students.

Capacity seems to be reached first in those fields where there a job is waiting for trained workers. How can the Federal Government help address this problem?

Mr. MILLS. We certainly feel, as we have talked about this, that there is an important need today for an additional title to work toward this goal and that is, meeting this specific need.

If the institutions are capable of doing this, in terms of facilities, then there are second shifts on schools. You will find that not many institutions have adequate dollars to put on the second shift or even a third shift.

If these dollars in a special title were provided, you could flow those as you would flow other special dollars to those institutions which wish to institute new programs because they are strapped right now in terms of their State and local dollars in terms of their ability to serve these people.

This is simply because they cannot go beyond their particular structure.

If you had the special resources for them, then I see in those areas of high unemployment that you speak of where they would have the capacity to do it if you had that kind of direct support.

Mr. KILDEE. The President last year asked for a cut of 25 percent in the funding of vocational education. We on this committee, through a bipartisan effort, were able to hold that to just 16 percent. Now the administration is asking for a 32-percent cut.

Does it seem incompatible to you, for the administration to say that we should reindustrialize this country and then cut vocational education in that fashion?

Mr. MILLS. It is a serious mistake for them to think that. You have the concept of the growth in new defense contracting.

Everybody is telling us in the defense industry, and we have some in Florida, that if the demand comes through in terms of increasing the defense posture, that we will have to have more people trained in specialized areas.

The demand is going to be there. There is going to be an increased demand which you do not have in the flow of training people now.

Therefore, I say that if that effort is going to be there, then you are going to need the resources to provide that additional workforce that they are talking about.

Mr. KILDEE. It was clearly stated in the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, that education, particularly education in vocational training, is more than a local concern. It is a national concern. I think we can see it now.

Mr. Simon?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for being in and out. But that is the nature of things around here.

I want to point out that two of the witnesses have southern Illinois roots. One is a resident of southern Illinois, Diane Lutes. Dick Wilson originally is from southern Illinois. He may deny that, but that is a reality.

So, I want you to know that you have some distinguished witnesses here.

Mr. KILDEE. Paul Simon, because he is who he is, and what he is, got me down to southern Illinois for a hearing not long ago. I think it was the coldest day that southern Illinois ever experienced.

Mr. SIMON. It was the coldest day we had in 63 years. Yes, I recall that. [Laughter.]

Let me add one other thing for the record.

The contribution that the community colleges in our area in southern Illinois are making to vocational education, is incalculable.

For example, at Rend Lake College, we were able to pull an industry in because it was able to say to that industry, General Tire, that we would help train their people that they need and the technicians.

And for an area of high unemployment like ours is, this has been of tremendous help to us.

Any assistance that we can provide at the Federal level within our somewhat limited means—and they are getting more limited all the time—we ought to be providing.

Again, my apologies for being in and out. We are on some budget matters that are also of interest to community colleges in southern Illinois.

I thank you.

Mr. KILDEE. Before I yield, I will call on the chairman, Mr. Perkins.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask the entire panel this. Let us assume that the Federal law was to be changed to have the vocational money follow the students to the various institutions.

Will total funding, including State and local funds, really be equalized among institutions? What is your answer to that?

Dr. WILSON. I am not sure I fully understand the question, Mr. Chairman.

The last part was about equalization.

Chairman PERKINS. We were talking about the Federal law being changed to have the vocational money follow the students to their various institutions.

Will total funding, including State and local funds, really be equalized among institutions?

Dr. WILSON. There would be an equitable division of the resources. As to whether it is actually equalized or not, it would depend on the formulas used by the different States.

I think all of us recognize that the States do have different ways of calculating the amounts of money, depending upon the resources of the district.

In other words, they have a State equalization tax formula, in some States.

Second, they recognize that some occupational programs are more expensive than others. So they allocate money differently, such as they give more money for States enrolled in the health-related technology and less for students enrolled in the business-related technologies.

Setting all of that aside, I would say that it would be more equitable of equalizing as a way of distributing the money.

Chairman PERKINS. Dr. Rowlett?

Dr. ROWLETT. I think there would be greater equity involved in this approach.

I would agree with the prior comment that different programs cost different amounts of money for a full-time equivalent enrollment.

This would need to take into account program costs in addition to the head count enrollment.

The experience of the Askew Institution shown in our testimony indicate that we have not done very well.

Chairman PERKINS. Ms. Lutes?

Ms. LUTES. I have to agree with Dick Wilson. We feel it would be more equitable.

Chairman PERKINS. I believe you were the one who brought out that formula.

Ms. LUTES. Yes, I did not realize it would be controversial.

We also have in the State of Illinois the more expensive programs with higher costs, like nursing, and mining technology. They do get more moneys and our lower cost vocational programs, like business, get less.

We feel that if the Federal Government would take the lead in having the dollars follow the students, that it would end up in a more equitable distribution based on taking into account the cost of the various programs.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Mills?

Mr. MILLS. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I have to be in disagreement with the three people who are at the table with me.

First of all, I think we have to determine what the purpose of the Federal legislation was. I do not believe we ever had a purpose that said that we were going to try to equalize the funding with State and local dollars.

Throughout this country we have States which have made a decision to fully fund the postsecondary programs and have used the Federal dollars in the secondary, and vice versa.

We have a variety of combinations.

It has always been my understanding that the objective of the Federal legislation was to make change in education to improve the quality of what we are doing.

We do have equalization formulas in our State which are based on the tax structure locally. It determines how much a State and how much the local people put in.

But I would hate to see us get to the point where we dump the Federal dollars into that pot and simply distribute the dollars on the basis of increased supply as to what it might be per student.

I do not think we could make the impact that we have made, for instance, in the opening of a center for health education at Miami Dade Community College.

There we put a large sum of money. We did not distribute the dollars equally there. We distributed them on the basis on what the need was and where we were going that year.

So, I think if you go to this concept of attempting to follow the student, you might be in the place of some of the States where the legislatures have made the decision that they will equally distribute \$5 to each secondary student or otherwise.

You will not have the impact that I think you have asked for with the Federal dollar in terms of meeting the needs of America and the change we have had.

So, I do not believe in this concept that you are going to follow the student in that regard.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Erdahl?

Mr. ERDAHL. Maybe this was taken up during my absence or somebody mentioned this before.

There is concern over unemployment in the country. If one of the ways to deal with that is training adults, should we be looking at the possibility of having an adult education title?

I think Mr. Mills mentioned that. Maybe we could explore the possibility of giving an emphasis to adult education dealing with the changes in society and also dealing with the unacceptable unemployment level.

We hear about the black minority youth unemployment. It is atrocious. But also among the adult general population it is high.

I wonder if anyone would care to respond.

Mr. MILLS. You put your figure on it, sir. The things we have talked about are those.

We, in our State, are in the economic growth status in terms of new industries down there. These industries are expanding so far as the State of Florida is concerned.

They are coming to us, both large and small. I had a gentleman to call me just yesterday. He wanted to open up a new screen door business in Ocala, Fla.

He said: "What kind of help can you give me in training this work force? I am going to put 50 people on, but I need assistance."

I think with the limited dollars we put in, both Federal and State, we are going to be able to go down there and establish a program for them.

Mr. ERDAHL. Let me follow up.

Can that be done effectively without an adult education title in the act?

Mr. MILLS. I think you would focus on this. If you focused on the issue with an additional title, then you are going to give the impetus to what you would like to have carried out.

Mr. ERDAHL. Would anyone else like to respond?

Dr. WILSON. My response is that you do not need the adult title. If you have the money, go with the students. The students are increasingly going to be adults anyway.

Second, by having the money follow the students you are not denying the change capability of the money. That is the purpose of our legislation.

You insist the money is still used for change purposes. There is no contradiction in having the money follow the students and being used for change.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Craig?

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate all the testimony this morning. Obviously there are some inherent conflicts from the panel.

I find it interesting that we can all agree that major demographic shifts are at hand, that we are going to move more into the role and the responsibility of postsecondary and adult education in training, and that we are going to get money to follow the students.

Some do not want a sole State agency and others feel it is necessary. Some do not believe that the specific title in the reauthorization toward adult education is required.

I guess that offers me some ultimate frustration in the fact that we seem, at least some members of the panel, to feel that the sole caretakership rests in this committee and the Congress; certainly not in the State and local units of government, which have been very responsive in the last 20 years in really causing it to happen.

All we have to do is look at the breakdown as to where the money has truly come from.

You know that we can offer leadership, but we cannot fund the programs. We can offer direction, we can cause money to go in certain directions and that State moneys will follow; but the bulk of the programs, and the quality of those programs still rest within the State.

Dr. Wilson, with that general feeling in mind, and having been involved in the vocational education area for some time, I find it almost a contradiction of terms to say there should not be a sole State agency.

I really have not received from you the basic reason as to why that ought to be. Yet, your testimony says that it seems to be the case. Or, you would prefer that to be the case.

Dr. WILSON. Yes; testimony is very clear on that point. No. 1, our contention is that the decision regarding the administration of vocational education should be made at the State level.

For the Federal statute to dictate a sole State agency is to, in effect, remove that decision from the States which is being made at the Federal level. We question that.

Second, the problem that has been brought to our attention is what we call the unevenness of the decisions and the allocation of the resources made in the different States.

For example, if you look at a State like Wisconsin where the same board that is responsible for vocational education is also responsible for postsecondary institutions. Most of the money goes to postsecondary.

In other States where the same board is responsible for secondary and elementary schools, as well as vocational education, then you find most of the money tends to go to those schools, that is, the secondary schools.

So, there is the unevenness across the country.

We would prefer to get away from the requirement of the sole State agency and let each State figure out how it can administer the funds and coordinate the activities in the best possible way.

We have nothing against coordination and we are fully supportive of that, but we protest the arrangement whereby people who are more aware and concerned about one sector of education versus another, are also in control of vocational education.

They are making what we view as really an unfair kind of decision.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Mills, do you wish to comment in relation to that?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know if you can tell about equalization simply by looking at the Federal dollar. The States make a decision on the distribution of their State dollars.

There may be an unequal distribution there, so far as that is concerned.

For instance, in the State of Florida, if you were to try to compare what an FTE was worth in a community college versus a K through 12, you would have a difficult time. But the State is providing for those institutions on the basis of what their request is and their resources are in order to meet the needs of those programs.

I speak out strongly for a sole State agency because the uniqueness of the vocational program is that we are looking at something that is geared to a demand for employment on behalf of what the community needs in the way of trained people and on the demands of individual people for training.

We are finding in our role of coordinating that venture that is the situation.

By the way, in the distribution of our dollars in every section of the act, we have a committee made up of all the units of the State government in looking at the distribution.

So, everybody gets their input into the program.

But I do not know how you are ever going to have a coordinated program that will get the maximum utilization of all dollars if you have separate agencies trying to make decisions about the same things in terms of the job market.

So, the concept of the sole State agency or a group having that responsibility, whether it is a committee or a single unit within government, makes pretty good sense to me. I think we have been successful so far as we are concerned.

I do not know why you would want to change something like that.

Mr. CRAIG. Do either of the other two panelists want to comment in that general context?

Dr. ROWLETT. The testimony prepared for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities indicates very clearly that the Askew type institutions are having some problems with the sole State agency concept in terms of distribution of postsecondary dollars to the Askew institutions.

These are boards made up of individuals and in some cases their primary concerns for elementary and secondary education is there. They make decisions about allocation of postsecondary and vocational dollars.

The Askew testimony indicates that in a number of instances the money does not flow where the students are.

That testimony indicates that in Kentucky we probably fare better than most colleges and universities in working with the State board for the funds coming to our programs.

But still we receive perhaps \$10 per student of those students enrolled in the postsecondary programs.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Craig, in some of our States, I know the legislatures make some very strong decisions on the distribution. Some of

them would like to distribute it strictly on a formula basis to local districts so far as they are concerned.

That bothers me because it becomes a maintenance dollar just as a support for the rest of the maintenance. You will not get the kind of action that we need so far as the national level is concerned.

So, I would hate to see us get to that point of even looking at the block grant concept of giving it to the States and telling them to do the job without guidelines.

In any State you have that degree of coordination.

I am not aware of the problem that other people speak of. I thought Illinois was fairly well organized so far as their programs are concerned.

You may have some problems so far as our State is concerned, but the problem of equalization and distribution of dollars is not there.

When you consider that we have the disadvantage, which is the target group that we want to give, and even though we place those dollars on a formula basis for districts and community colleges to utilize them, they may or may not direct their efforts to that particular program.

So, we may end up giving more dollars to somebody else.

The same thing is true for handicapped. The makeup of the population may be such as this. If you take Dade County, we have a higher rate of unemployment down there than we do in the capital city of Tallahassee.

Therefore, I think as we look at the disadvantaged situation down there, we ought to pump extra dollars down there. We did last year and the year before.

As a followup of that riot situation, we did that. We did it trying to get dollars for those we had already trained. I think it was successful.

But if we try to do it on a per pupil basis for everybody and give so many dollars, then the impact of the dollar will not be effective, so far as that is concerned.

My understanding is that Minnesota alone, with all the Federal dollars, goes into the postsecondary program. In the State of Wisconsin about 60 percent of the dollars goes into the postsecondary program.

There are just no two of us that are alike so far as this is concerned.

As for the sole State agencies, somebody has to coordinate the show to make sure that we do the best job with what we have.

I know that our legislature certainly stays on our back in terms of making certain that we do not have a duplication of effort. In fact, just now our staff is going to look at the total adult basic education to make certain that we do not have duplication, unwarranted duplication.

Mr. CRAIG. I want to thank all of you very much.

Dr. WILSON. Minnesota was mentioned with a large portion going into postsecondary. Actually no money goes into the technical colleges in Minnesota. They have an unusual arrangement there with what is called postsecondary in Minnesota may not necessarily be postsecondary in other States.

So that is the trickiness of the whole thing.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank you all.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank all of you. You have been an outstanding panel. You have been very helpful to the committee.

I do not know whether we will move a bill this year or next year. But certainly we will get the views of everybody and we will try to do what is best for the general public.

At this time I would like to insert into the record a statement by Robert Worthington, Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education.

Without objection, so ordered.

[Prepared statement of Robert Worthington follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to submit for the record this written statement on vocational postsecondary and adult education.

In your July 1 letter to Secretary Bell you requested that certain information be provided to the Subcommittee. Answers to your inquiries regarding State's fulfillment of the 15 percent set-aside requirement for postsecondary and adult vocational education are included in the Addendum Tables with explanations in the text on pages 3 and 4. Information on how States are using the set-aside funds is in the section on Institutions, pages 6-7, and the section on Program Areas, pages 8-10. We address the sole State agency issue on page 10.

Background

Vocational education beyond the high school level has experienced dramatic growth over the past decade. Much of this growth can be attributed to the emergence of a complex of public-supported institutions offering comprehensive occupational instruction in new technological and service fields. These new institutions have come into existence to serve a new and burgeoning clientele for whom high school vocational education programs are unavailable or inadequate. Many of these students are high school graduates who have already been employed and are returning to school to learn new skills or upgrade skills already acquired. Many are adults who are returning to school to improve or advance in their current jobs or to get jobs in new occupations.

Section 110(c) of the Vocational Education Act, as amended, requires each State to use a minimum of 15 percent of its 102(a) allotment (Subparts 2 and 3 combined) for vocational education programs at the postsecondary and adult levels. The Act further stipulates that the Federal share of the cost of such programs will not exceed 50 percent, i.e., that States must match this program dollar-for-dollar. Funds are to be used for vocational education programs: (1) for persons in programs leading to an associate or other degree but not designed to lead to a baccalaureate or higher degree; (2) for persons already in the labor market; and (3) for persons who have completed or left high school and who are not covered by item (1) or (2) above.

The purpose of the postsecondary and adult provision in the Act is to encourage States to provide programs: (1) to prepare technicians and specialists as support personnel for professionals and managers; (2) to prepare skilled workers; and (3) to upgrade and update an individual's education, and generally improve current skills or teach new job skills.

Vocational education at the postsecondary level is offered by public and private collegiate and noncollegiate institutions. This is in contrast to vocational education at the secondary level, which is offered primarily through the public school system. Short and long-term vocational education programs for adults who attend school on a part-time basis are held at all types of institutions, including public schools that serve secondary students during regular school hours.

Definitional Problems

Postsecondary occupational education has given rise to serious definitional problems that affect the program enrollment statistics to be cited later. The major problem has resulted from attempts to distinguish programs for traditional college-age students seeking immediate post-high school training from those designed for older individuals who may have been employed and away from formal education for considerable time periods.

The distinction was first made because the Vocational Education Act (VEA) of 1963 broadened the scope of Federal aid to vocational education to include "persons of all ages in all communities of the State" including persons "who have completed or left high school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market" and alternatively, "persons...who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment...excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations (determined) to be...professional or which require a baccalaureate or higher degree" (from VEA, Sections 108, 121, and 122(a)). The former group was considered "postsecondary," while the latter was considered "adult." However, the distinction between these groups was not always clear, and there were wide variances among State postsecondary educational systems and classifications.

Following the intent of Congress, as stated in the 1976 reauthorization hearings, a distinction was made in the regulations established pursuant to the 1976 VEA reauthorization:

"'Postsecondary program' means vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are enrolled in organized programs of study for which credit is given toward an associate or other degree but which programs are not designed as baccalaureate or higher degree programs." (Emphasis added.) 34 CFR 608, Appendix A.

"'Adult program' means vocational education for persons who have already entered the labor market or who are unemployed or who have completed or left high school and who are not described in the definition of postsecondary program." (Emphasis added.)

This regulation, changing to a degree-linked definition of postsecondary and adult programs, had the effect of shifting some students from the postsecondary to the adult level.

The Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) in its 1978-79 field test used a modified degree-linked system. However, in its 1979-80 data collection, data was collected by institution rather than by individual, so postsecondary and adult students were combined. Therefore the discussion and tables in the following sections of the statement show separate numbers for postsecondary and adult students for the years through 1979, while 1980 data show postsecondary and adult students combined. Additionally VEDS does not distinguish between postsecondary and adult vocational education programs in its collection of expenditure data.

Expenditures

Postsecondary and adult vocational education is the fastest growing sector of the entire educational enterprise. Between school years 1977-78 and 1979-80, expenditures for these programs increased by almost 80 percent - growing from \$1.5 billion in school years 1977-78 to over \$2.7 billion in 1979-80. Almost all of this increase can be attributed to State and local revenues as Table 1 shows.

Table 1 - Expenditures for Postsecondary and Adult Vocational Education by Revenue Source and Year

Governmental level	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Federal	\$ 106,338,102	\$ 133,089,520	\$ 138,122,602
State and local	1,438,671,546	2,006,417,163	2,630,974,935
Total	1,545,009,648	2,139,508,683	2,769,097,537
Percent Federal of total	6.9	6.2	5.0

Source: The Vocational Education Data System, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Federal revenues (funds appropriated directly for these programs) accounted for only \$32 million of the increase while State and local revenues grew by almost \$2.2 billion. As a consequence, the Federal funding share for these programs is declining rapidly, and as of school year 1979-80, was only 5 percent of the total as is shown in Table 1.

Attached as an addendum to this statement is a State-by-State table showing outlays for postsecondary and adult vocational education by revenue source for school year 1979-80. While the aggregate Federal share of postsecondary and adult vocational education expenditures amounted to only 5 percent for that year, the percentages varied widely across States. For example, Federal funds accounted for almost 52 percent of expenditures for these programs in New Hampshire while accounting for less than 2 percent in Florida.

In the aggregate, States have expended substantially more of their Section 102(a) allotments for postsecondary and adult programs than the statute requires.

Table 2 - Expenditures of Subpart 2 and 3 Funds for Postsecondary and Adult Vocational Education by Year

	FY 1978	FY 1979	FY 1980
Subpart 2 & 3 expenditures	\$336,086,938	\$304,813,000	\$471,972,000
Postsecondary/adult expenditures	81,888,995	133,089,320	138,122,602
Percent post-secondary/adult expenditures is of Subpart 2&3	24.7	36.3	29.4

Source: The Vocational Education Data System, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education

While the Act requires that no less than 15 percent of a State's allotment for Subparts 2 and 3 be expended for postsecondary and adult education programs, Table 2 shows that the aggregate expenditure level for these programs has exceeded 20 percent of these subpart expenditures in recent years. From fiscal year 1978 to fiscal year 1980, States increased their expenditures of Subpart 2 and 3 funds for postsecondary and adult education by 68.6 percent.

Due to the applicability to these funds of Section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, States have a maximum of 27 months within which to spend any particular year's allotment of Subpart 2 and 3 funds. Consequently, in order to determine if a State has met the 15 percent minimum expenditure requirement for postsecondary and adult vocational education, one must track a particular year's allotment through a 27-month period.

Attached as an addendum to this Statement is a table which displays by State the expenditures of Subpart 2 and 3 allotment for fiscal year 1979 through the allowable 27-month expenditure period for these funds. The addendum table shows that 5 States and 3 Insular Areas did not meet the 15 percent minimum expenditure requirement for their fiscal year 1979 allotment of Subpart 2 and 3 funds.

These data are subject to reconciliation with final expenditure reports, which have not been received in all cases. Additionally, it should be noted that the Table 2 figures are based on expenditures made within each fiscal year, and as a consequence will not coincide with the figures shown on the addendum table.

Institutions

In 1978-79, HCES reported over 10,000 collegiate and noncollegiate postsecondary institutions, including correspondence schools, with occupational programs.

Table 3 - Number of Institutions by Type

Control and type of institution 1978-79	Number
Total postsecondary	10,043
Public noncollegiate postsecondary institutions	812
Private noncollegiate postsecondary institutions	6,813
Correspondence schools	83
2-year institutions of higher education	1,135
4-year institutions of higher education	847
State correctional facilities	553

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Vocational Education, 1981

The largest type of provider at the postsecondary level is the private noncollegiate postsecondary institution. More than 60 percent of these 6,813 schools have enrollments of 100 students or less. Although the 812 public schools in the noncollegiate category generally had somewhat larger enrollments, more than half had 250 or fewer students in 1978.

The bulk of the institutions in the public sector are 2-year junior and community colleges (905 or 44 percent), vocational-technical institutes (591 or 29 percent), and 4-year colleges and universities (260 or 13 percent).

In contrast, the bulk of the institutions in the private sector are small, single-purpose barber and cosmetology schools (2,123 or 29 percent), specialized business schools (1,385 or 19 percent), and flight schools (927 or 13 percent).

Table 4 shows that the rapid acceleration in numbers of public institutions offering occupational programs which characterized the 1960's slowed to a plateau in the 1970's. The only appreciable growth occurred in comprehensive vocational-technical institutes (from 453 in 1976 to 591 in 1980) and 4-year colleges and universities (from 219 in 1976 to 260 in 1980).

Private schools have declined steadily in number (from 8,328 in 1974 to 7,432 in 1980), though their enrollments have continued to rise.

See Table 4 for a breakout on the number of schools by type of institution.

The schools which comprise the universe of some 10,000 postsecondary vocational education providers include institutions offering programs administered under the Vocational Education Act (VEA) as well as others outside the jurisdiction and scope of the Act. Thus a share, but not all, of the enrollments in these institutions are included in the State Plans for Vocational Education and reported as part of the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS).

TABLE 4.—TRENDS IN NUMBER OF POSTSECONDARY SCHOOLS WITH OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL, CONTROL, AND ACCREDITATION STATUS: AGGREGATE UNITED STATES, 1971, 1974, 1976, 1978, and 1980
(UNIVERSE DATA)

TYPE OF SCHOOL, CONTROL, AND ACCREDITATION STATUS	1971	1974	1976		1978	1980
			OCC DEFINITIONS	NEW DEFINITIONS		
PUBLIC—TOTAL SCHOOLS	1,756	1,938	1,941	1,941	1,933	1,961
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL	360	381	333	433	306	391
TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	122	138	148	148	122	2
BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL	3	1	3	3	4	3
COSMETOLOGY/HAIRER	4	4	7	7	6	3
FLIGHT SCHOOL	3	6	3	5	3	1
TRAIN SCHOOL	34	30	34	17	14	8
ARTS/DESIGN	-	-	-	1	0	0
HOSPITAL SCHOOL	119	171	136	136	147	171
ALLIED HEALTH	-	-	-	127	114	117
JUNIOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	458	790	783	783	788	985
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	217	217	219	219	234	360
OTHER	13	13	9	-	1	0
CORRESPONDENCE	0	1	-	-	-	-
PRIVATE—TOTAL SCHOOLS	9,938	8,338	7,842	7,842	7,382	7,432
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL	841	397	378	186	112	98
TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	360	176	132	132	113	103
BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL	1,474	1,273	1,141	1,260	1,297	1,383
COSMETOLOGY/HAIRER	2,438	2,401	2,241	2,243	2,163	2,123
FLIGHT SCHOOL	1,877	1,479	1,323	1,327	1,839	827
TRAIN SCHOOL	1,038	681	711	743	736	743
ARTS/DESIGN	-	-	-	235	234	230
HOSPITAL SCHOOL	1,143	1,078	921	922	770	688
ALLIED HEALTH	-	-	-	214	245	287
JUNIOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	129	110	239	229	301	211
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	173	200	218	218	241	287
OTHER	225	202	209	171	191	224
CORRESPONDENCE	135	129	105	-	-	-
PRIVATE—ACCREDITED SCHOOLS	6,436	6,127	5,873	5,873	4,991	5,321
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL	447	388	330	77	73	70
TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	184	134	114	114	93	90
BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL	962	839	738	790	719	740
COSMETOLOGY/HAIRER	1,477	1,778	1,784	1,788	1,643	1,710
FLIGHT SCHOOL	1,342	1,231	976	981	822	713
TRAIN SCHOOL	343	343	377	373	334	411
ARTS/DESIGN	-	-	-	143	139	144
HOSPITAL SCHOOL	1,016	978	837	828	679	638
ALLIED HEALTH	-	-	-	144	133	184
JUNIOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	134	108	201	201	134	207
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	167	197	206	208	144	387
OTHER	30	23	38	14	16	23
CORRESPONDENCE	114	86	73	-	-	-

Sources: NCES Fifth Biennial Survey of Postsecondary Schools with Occupational Programs, 1980

Likewise, at the postsecondary level the receipt of Federal funds under the Act varies depending on the type of institution. It is estimated that over three-fourths of the 1-year institutions of higher education offer VEA-administered programs. However only two-fifths of public noncollegiate postsecondary schools and less than one-third of State correctional facilities receive VEA funds. Only about 5 percent of the 4-year institutions of higher education, and virtually none of the private noncollegiate postsecondary schools or correspondence schools are included. Information regarding these schools, their offerings, enrollments, and other data must be obtained from sources other than VEDS.

Enrollments

In school year 1979-80, 6.4 million postsecondary and adult students were served nationwide in vocational education programs under the Vocational Education Act. (See Table 3)

Table 3 - Enrollments in Postsecondary Vocational Education
For Selected Fiscal Years

Fiscal Year	Postsecondary	Adult	Total
1972	1,304,092	3,066,404	4,370,496
1976	2,202,800	4,069,375	6,272,375
1978*	2,082,456	4,142,851	6,225,397
1979	1,946,758	4,739,314	6,686,314
1980**	-	-	6,370,848

* The regulations implementing the Vocational Education Act, as amended in 1976, changed the definition of postsecondary program which shifted some students to the adult level.

** For FY 1980 postsecondary and adult enrollments were combined in VEDS, and do not include Outlying Areas.

Source: Vocational Education Data System, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Enrollments in postsecondary vocational education have remained relatively constant since 1976, after large increases over the preceding years. However, enrollments in both postsecondary and adult programs have been growing faster than enrollments in secondary programs, and together they comprise approximately 40 percent of the total enrollment and approximately 60 percent of the occupationally specific enrollment in vocational education.

Table 4 shows the distribution of postsecondary vocational education students by sex and racial/ethnic group.

Table 6 - Percentage Distribution of Postsecondary Vocational Education Students by Racial/Ethnic Group 1979-80

	All programs, both sexes	Male	Female
Total	100.0*	49.5	47.2
White	73.1	67.3	39.6
Black	12.8	8.3	6.6
Hispanic	6.6	3.6	3.0
American Indian/ Alaskan native	1.2	0.7	0.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6	1.5	1.3
Nonresident alien	0.6	0.2	0.2

* Sex unknown - 3.6 percent

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Vocational Education Data System, The Condition of Education, 1982.

Enrollments were almost evenly divided between males and females, although there are wide differences in enrollments within specific program areas (see section on programs). Of the 24.1 percent of the students who were minorities, the majority were black (12.8 percent) or Hispanic (6.6 percent).

Any discussion of postsecondary and adult vocational education should address the effects of vocational education on the learner. While data on the outcomes associated with participation in postsecondary programs are limited, what data are available suggest (using a variety of measures) that postsecondary schooling below the baccalaureate level confers an advantage on high school graduates. This advantage is greatest for white female high school graduates. For this group, those who take a postsecondary program have a higher labor force participation rate, fewer weeks per year of unemployment, and jobs with higher occupational status than white female graduates with no postsecondary schooling. For a further discussion of the effects of vocational education on participants, see chapter VII of The Vocational Education Study, National Institute of Education, September 1981.

Program Areas

The enrollment figures for fiscal year 1980 indicate that the program area most in demand by vocational education students at the postsecondary and adult level is trade and industrial, with more than one in four enrollments. One in every five students enrolled in an office occupations program. These two major program areas accounted for half of all enrollments in postsecondary vocational education in fiscal year 1980. A distant third was consumer and homemaking, which accounted for only 12 percent of postsecondary and adult vocational education enrollments. Table 7 provides a listing of the major program area enrollments, by sex and race.

Table 7 - Postsecondary and Adult Enrollment by Program Area, Sex and Race for Fiscal Year 1980

Program Area	Enrollment	Percent of Total	Percent Women	Percent Minorities
Trade and Industrial	1,799,737	28.2	19.3	25.0
Office occupations	1,637,896	22.4	67.6	27.1
Consumer and homemaking	763,175	12.0	n/a	n/a
Health	705,624	11.1	81.2	18.6
Distribution	564,705	8.9	50.8	20.6
Technical	467,155	7.3	18.6	19.9
Agricultural occupations	221,282	3.5	31.9	11.0
Occupational home economics	190,089	3.0	81.0	28.4
Industrial arts	19,243	0.3	n/a	n/a
Other	211,922	3.3	50.5	17.1
Total	6,370,848	100.0	47.2	23.5

Source: Vocational Education Data System

An examination of Table 7 reveals that women dominated enrollments during fiscal year 1980 in four of the seven program areas for which enrollment figures by sex are available: health, occupational home economics, office occupations, and distribution.

Minority student enrollments were clustered in certain program areas, including occupational home economics, office occupations, trade and industrial, and distribution. Minority women accounted for approximately 43 percent of the minority enrollments in occupational home economics, 71 percent in office occupations, 16 percent in trade and industrial, and slightly over 30 percent in distribution.

Expenditure figures for fiscal year 1980 indicate that the program areas with the largest enrollments also received the largest share of the vocational education dollars directly supporting instruction. For example, trade and industrial and office occupations, which were first and second, respectively, in terms of enrollments, were also first and second in terms of the amount of dollars that flowed into the various program areas. Trade and industrial accounted for 30 percent of the expenditures for instruction and office occupations accounted for 23 percent. Combined they accounted for 53 percent of the expenditures for instruction. The table below provides a break out of these funds by program areas.

Table 8 - Direct Instructional Expenditures from All Sources for Postsecondary and Adult Vocational Education in Fiscal Year 1980 by Program Area

Program area	Expenditure	Total percent	Federal percent	Nonfederal percent
Total	2,020,969,000	100.0	6.6	93.4
Trade and industrial	609,576,000	30.2	7.1	92.9
Office occupations	462,850,000	22.9	4.7	95.3
Health	336,115,000	16.6	5.8	94.2
Technical	220,282,000	10.9	6.4	93.6
Distribution	118,174,000	5.8	4.2	95.8
Agriculture occupations	70,801,000	3.5	8.5	91.5
Home economics	69,097,000	3.4	4.9	95.1
Consumer and homemaking	33,306,000	1.6	15.8	84.2
Industrial arts	2,497,000	0.1	10.3	89.7
Others	98,271,000	4.8	15.5	84.5

Source: Vocational Education Data System

A listing of enrollments and expenditures by program area provides only part of the picture of postsecondary and adult programs. To complete the picture, a discussion of a few of the many programs currently being supported in new or changing occupations and in national needs areas is necessary. Two examples, both in the area of energy production, are illustrative of the many programs currently being supported. At the request of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association, three Kansas Community Colleges jointly implemented a multi-campus pilot training program for rigbuilder helpers, rotary drill helpers, roustabouts, and pumpers.

New Mexico is concentrating its postsecondary Federal dollars on efforts to improve and expand programs to handle the expanded needs for skilled workers in energy-related fields. Job shortages that have been identified include underground miners, coal miners, oil field workers, solar technicians, and geothermal technicians. There has been a tremendous expansion in programs throughout the State to meet these needs.

Response to Sole State Agency Inquiry

In addition to its concern with postsecondary and adult vocational education issues, the Subcommittee inquired as to whether the Department favored retention of the sole-State agency requirement as part of the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

Section 105(a) of the Department's proposal entitled the "Vocational and Adult Education Consolidation Act of 1982" states in part that :

"The Proposed Use Report must designate the

single State agency or instrumentality that is responsible for the administration or supervision of the administration of the State's program under Part 3 including its compliance with all the requirements of this Act."

The corresponding language in the existing Act (Section 104(a)(1)) states:

"Any State desiring to participate in the programs authorized by this Act shall, consistent with State law, designate or establish a State board or agency (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'State board') which shall be the sole State agency responsible for the administration, or for the supervision of the administration, of such programs."

While the two provisions differ somewhat as to wording, it is our view that the two provisions are substantively identical as to the "sole State agency" requirement.

Attachment Table

UNITARY PLAN COMPLETION AND POSTCOMPLETION RECONSTRUCTION UNDER SECTION 110 (INCLUSIVE) COMPROMISE
OF BUDGET OF FUNDS, PERCENT, DATES, AND BY STATE
UNITED STATES, DISTRICT COURT, SECOND YEAR 1979-80

STATE	TOTAL	FEDERAL	FEDERAL	FEDERAL AS PERCENT OF TOTAL	DATES IN UNIT-FEDERAL TO FEDERAL
ALABAMA	24,040,000	22,000,000	1,920,000	8.0	15.10
ALASKA	10,000,000	20,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	0.00
ARIZONA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
ARKANSAS	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
CALIFORNIA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
COLORADO	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
CONNECTICUT	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
DELAWARE	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
FLORIDA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
GEORGIA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
HAWAII	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
IDaho	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
ILLINOIS	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
INDIANA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
IOWA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
KANSAS	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
KENTUCKY	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
LOUISIANA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MAINE	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MARYLAND	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MASSACHUSETTS	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MICHIGAN	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MINNESOTA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MISSISSIPPI	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MISSOURI	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
MONTANA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEBRASKA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEVADA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEW JERSEY	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEW MEXICO	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NEW YORK	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NORTH CAROLINA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
NORTH DAKOTA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
OHIO	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
OKLAHOMA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
OREGON	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
PENNSYLVANIA	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00
RHODE ISLAND	10,000,000	10,000,000	1,000,000	10.0	10.00

Estimated Water Requirements for State of Mississippi, 1967
 (Continued from PT 170) (The following figures represent estimated values)

STATE	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043	2044	2045	2046	2047	2048	2049	2050	2051	2052	2053	2054	2055	2056	2057	2058	2059	2060	2061	2062	2063	2064	2065	2066	2067	2068	2069	2070	2071	2072	2073	2074	2075	2076	2077	2078	2079	2080	2081	2082	2083	2084	2085	2086	2087	2088	2089	2090	2091	2092	2093	2094	2095	2096	2097	2098	2099	2100	2101	2102	2103	2104	2105	2106	2107	2108	2109	2110	2111	2112	2113	2114	2115	2116	2117	2118	2119	2120	2121	2122	2123	2124	2125	2126	2127	2128	2129	2130	2131	2132	2133	2134	2135	2136	2137	2138	2139	2140	2141	2142	2143	2144	2145	2146	2147	2148	2149	2150	2151	2152	2153	2154	2155	2156	2157	2158	2159	2160	2161	2162	2163	2164	2165	2166	2167	2168	2169	2170	2171	2172	2173	2174	2175	2176	2177	2178	2179	2180	2181	2182	2183	2184	2185	2186	2187	2188	2189	2190	2191	2192	2193	2194	2195	2196	2197	2198	2199	2200	2201	2202	2203	2204	2205	2206	2207	2208	2209	2210	2211	2212	2213	2214	2215	2216	2217	2218	2219	2220	2221	2222	2223	2224	2225	2226	2227	2228	2229	2230	2231	2232	2233	2234	2235	2236	2237	2238	2239	2240	2241	2242	2243	2244	2245	2246	2247	2248	2249	2250	2251	2252	2253	2254	2255	2256	2257	2258	2259	2260	2261	2262	2263	2264	2265	2266	2267	2268	2269	2270	2271	2272	2273	2274	2275	2276	2277	2278	2279	2280	2281	2282	2283	2284	2285	2286	2287	2288	2289	2290	2291	2292	2293	2294	2295	2296	2297	2298	2299	2300	2301	2302	2303	2304	2305	2306	2307	2308	2309	2310	2311	2312	2313	2314	2315	2316	2317	2318	2319	2320	2321	2322	2323	2324	2325	2326	2327	2328	2329	2330	2331	2332	2333	2334	2335	2336	2337	2338	2339	2340	2341	2342	2343	2344	2345	2346	2347	2348	2349	2350	2351	2352	2353	2354	2355	2356	2357	2358	2359	2360	2361	2362	2363	2364	2365	2366	2367	2368	2369	2370	2371	2372	2373	2374	2375	2376	2377	2378	2379	2380	2381	2382	2383	2384	2385	2386	2387	2388	2389	2390	2391	2392	2393	2394	2395	2396	2397	2398	2399	2400	2401	2402	2403	2404	2405	2406	2407	2408	2409	2410	2411	2412	2413	2414	2415	2416	2417	2418	2419	2420	2421	2422	2423	2424	2425	2426	2427	2428	2429	2430	2431	2432	2433	2434	2435	2436	2437	2438	2439	2440	2441	2442	2443	2444	2445	2446	2447	2448	2449	2450	2451	2452	2453	2454	2455	2456	2457	2458	2459	2460	2461	2462	2463	2464	2465	2466	2467	2468	2469	2470	2471	2472	2473	2474	2475	2476	2477	2478	2479	2480	2481	2482	2483	2484	2485	2486	2487	2488	2489	2490	2491	2492	2493	2494	2495	2496	2497	2498	2499	2500	2501	2502	2503	2504	2505	2506	2507	2508	2509	2510	2511	2512	2513	2514	2515	2516	2517	2518	2519	2520	2521	2522	2523	2524	2525	2526	2527	2528	2529	2530	2531	2532	2533	2534	2535	2536	2537	2538	2539	2540	2541	2542	2543	2544	2545	2546	2547	2548	2549	2550	2551	2552	2553	2554	2555	2556	2557	2558	2559	2560	2561	2562	2563	2564	2565	2566	2567	2568	2569	2570	2571	2572	2573	2574	2575	2576	2577	2578	2579	2580	2581	2582	2583	2584	2585	2586	2587	2588	2589	2590	2591	2592	2593	2594	2595	2596	2597	2598	2599	2600	2601	2602	2603	2604	2605	2606	2607	2608	2609	2610	2611	2612	2613	2614	2615	2616	2617	2618	2619	2620	2621	2622	2623	2624	2625	2626	2627	2628	2629	2630	2631	2632	2633	2634	2635	2636	2637	2638	2639	2640	2641	2642	2643	2644	2645	2646	2647	2648	2649	2650	2651	2652	2653	2654	2655	2656	2657	2658	2659	2660	2661	2662	2663	2664	2665	2666	2667	2668	2669	2670	2671	2672	2673	2674	2675	2676	2677	2678	2679	2680	2681	2682	2683	2684	2685	2686	2687	2688	2689	2690	2691	2692	2693	2694	2695	2696	2697	2698	2699	2700	2701	2702	2703	2704	2705	2706	2707	2708	2709	2710	2711	2712	2713	2714	2715	2716	2717	2718	2719	2720	2721	2722	2723	2724	2725	2726	2727	2728	2729	2730	2731	2732	2733	2734	2735	2736	2737	2738	2739	2740	2741	2742	2743	2744	2745	2746	2747	2748	2749	2750	2751	2752	2753	2754	2755	2756	2757	2758	2759	2760	2761	2762	2763	2764	2765	2766	2767	2768	2769	2770	2771	2772	2773	2774	2775	2776	2777	2778	2779	2780	2781	2782	2783	2784	2785	2786	2787	2788	2789	2790	2791	2792	2793	2794	2795	2796	2797	2798	2799	2800	2801	2802	2803	2804	2805	2806	2807	2808	2809	2810	2811	2812	2813	2814	2815	2816	2817	2818	2819	2820	2821	2822	2823	2824	2825	2826	2827	2828	2829	2830	2831	2832	2833	2834	2835	2836	2837	2838	2839	2840	2841	2842	2843	2844	2845	2846	2847	2848	2849	2850	2851	2852	2853	2854	2855	2856	2857	2858	2859	2860	2861	2862	2863	2864	2865	2866	2867	2868	2869	2870	2871	2872	2873	2874	2875	2876	2877	2878	2879	2880	2881	2882	2883	2884	2885	2886	2887	2888	2889	2890	2891	2892	2893	2894	2895	2896	2897	2898	2899	2900	2901	2902	2903	2904	2905	2906	2907	2908	2909	2910	2911	2912	2913	2914	2915	2916	2917	2918	2919	2920	2921	2922	2923	2924	2925	2926	2927	2928	2929	2930	2931	2932	2933	2934	2935	2936	2937	2938	2939	2940	2941	2942	2943	2944	2945	2946	2947	2948	2949	2950	2951	2952	2953	2954	2955	2956	2957	2958	2959	2960	2961	2962	2963	2964	2965	2966	2967	2968	2969	2970	2971	2972	2973	2974	2975	2976	2977	2978	2979	2980	2981	2982	2983	2984	2985	2986	2987	2988	2989	2990	2991	2992	2993	2994	2995	2996	2997	2998	2999	3000	3001	3002	3003	3004	3005	3006	3007	3008	3009	3010	3011	3012	3013	3014	3015	3016	3017	3018	3019	3020	3021	3022	3023	3024	3025	3026	3027	3028	3029	3030	3031	3032	3033	3034	3035	3036	3037	3038	3039	3040	3041	3042	3043	3044	3045	3046	3047	3048	3049	3050	3051	3052	3053	3054	3055	3056	3057	3058	3059	3060	3061	3062	3063	3064	3065	3066	3067	3068	3069	3070	3071	3072	3073	3074	3075	3076	3077	3078	3079	3080	3081	3082	3083	3084	3085	3086	3087	3088	3089	3090	3091	3092	3093	3094	3095	3096	3097	3098	3099	3100	3101	3102	3103	3104	3105	3106	3107	3108	3109	3110	3111	3112	3113	3114	3115	3116	3117	3118	3119	3120	3121	3122	3123	3124	3125	3126	3127	3128	3129	3130	3131	3132	3133	3134	3135	3136	3137	3138	3139	3140	3141	3142	3143	3144	3145	3146	3147	3148	3149	3150	3151	3152	3153	3154	3155	3156	3157	3158	3159	3160	3161	3162	3163	3164	3165	3166	3167	3168	3169	3170	3171	3172	3173	3174	3175	3176	3177	3178	3179	3180	3181	3182	3183	3184	3185	3186	3187	3188	3189	3190	3191	3192	3193	3194	3195	3196	3197	3198	3199	3200	3201	3202	3203	3204	3205	3206	3207	3208	3209	3210	3211	3212	3213	3214	3215	3216	3217	3218	3219	3220	3221	3222	3223	3224	3225	3226	3227	3228	3229	3230	3231	3232	3233	3234	3235	3236	3237	3238	3239	3240	3241	3242	3243	3244	3245	3246	3247	3248	3249	3250	3251	3252	3253	3254	3255	3256	3257	3258	3259	3260	3261	3262	3263	3264	3265	3266	3267	3268	3269	3270	3271	3272	3273	3274	3275	3276	3277	3278	3279	3280	3281	3282	3283	3284	3285	3286	3287	3288	3289	3290	3291	3292	3293	3294	3295	3296	3297	3298	3299	3300	3301	3302	3303	3304	3305	3306	3307	3308	3309	3310	3311	3312	3313	3314	3315	3316	3317	3318	3319	3320	3321	3322	3323	3324	3325
-------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Chairman PERKINS. We want to thank you all for coming today. The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Material submitted for record follows:]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1982.

Mr. JAMES PIRIUS,
Office of Legislation,
U.S. Department of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PIRIUS: I am writing to request additional information for inclusion in the hearing record of July 22, 1982. On that day the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education discussed postsecondary vocational education programs.

After reviewing Dr. Worthington's written testimony, I feel we need to supplement the information provided by the Department in order to have a fuller hearing record.

The State-by-State table provided by the Department showing expenditures for postsecondary and adult vocational education does not separate the amounts expended for postsecondary programs and the amounts for adult as these terms are defined in the legislation. We would like a further breakdown, State-by-State, showing separately the outlays for postsecondary and the outlays for adult programs, if such information is available.

We would also like further information on the adult vocational education programs. At our hearing, one of the witnesses noted that funds used for "adult" programs and counted toward the 15 percent setaside are sometimes used for programs carried out in institutions other than postsecondary ones, including secondary schools. We would be interested, therefore, in receiving any information the Department has on the amount of adult vocational education program funds going to secondary institutions, to postsecondary institutions, and to other types of grantees.

In order to insert this information in the hearing record, we would need to have it by September 15. I appreciate your response to this request.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1982.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: This is in response to your request for specific information on Vocational Education outlays by level (postsecondary and adult), and types of institutions for inclusion in the hearing record of July 22, 1982. Unfortunately, we are unable to obtain the data needed to comply with your request.

Section 110(c) of the VEA mandates that a minimum of 15 percent of each State's allotment be used for both postsecondary and adult vocational education programs. Since States are not required by the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) to provide expenditure data separating postsecondary and adult levels, the National Center for Education Statistics does not have the data broken out separately. Consequently, the State-by-State table you requested is not available.

Likewise, VEDS does not require reporting of expenditure data by institutional stream (secondary/postsecondary schools). Consequently, we are unable to report comprehensively on the adult vocational education program funds going to secondary institutions, postsecondary institutions, or other grantees. However, based on the Department's contact with the States, through the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, we could probably ascertain the dollar amount going to secondary institutions in the following States: California, Utah, Ohio, Illinois, Oklahoma, and

Virginia. Because the data are not maintained at the Federal level, we would need to make inquiry of each State. I am not certain that the limited amount of data would prove useful, unless you were interested in a particular State. We will pursue the matter further if you think it is necessary.

We appreciate the opportunity to augment the hearing record but regret the lack of requested data.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, Ph. D.,
Assistant Secretary.



PUERTO RICO GAZETTE
HONOLULU, HAWAII

July 6, 1982

The Honorable Carl D. Perkins
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary,
Secondary, and Vocational Education
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Perkins:

I, hereby, transmit for your consideration, a report on our views on the future of the Federal Role on Vocational Education. This study represents the view point of an Hispanic Community Based Organization whose principal interest is the skill upgrading of the American labor force.

It is long overdue that the United States upgrade its national government's role in vocational education. The present system, mainly designed for the 60's, should be modified to meet the needs of the 80's and the years ahead. Since we want to continue being a first technical power in the world, we must improve the development and utilization of the Nation's human resources.

Some of the critical current realities of the federal role in vocational education are:

- 1) the 1963 Vocational Education Act, as amended, intends to do too much with little resources;
- 2) objectives of the programs to be funded with federal monies are not clear and sometimes contradictory (i.e.: extending and improving programs);
- 3) allocation formula of funds to states and territories does not accomplish intention of law;
- 4) intra-state distribution procedures of federal funds are ambiguous and not always mutually reinforcing;
- 5) programs for special populations have not produced the results intended;
- 6) evaluation requirements are not specific enough and some have little validity and reliability;
- 7) coordination with other educational and training programs has not been successful.



- JOB CORPS PROGRESS, INC.

July 6, 1982

The Honorable Carl D. Perkins
July 6, 1982

These shortcomings can be improved by:

- 1) focusing the scope of the federal resources toward occupational-specific programs with more emphasis on post-secondary vocational training;
- 2) clearly defining objectives in the law;
- 3) allocating funds to the States and territories with a standard formula which includes unemployment and related factors;
- 4) stipulating how the States and territories ought to re-distribute the federal contribution;
- 5) re-defining programs and approaches to special population groups and using community-based organizations as service providers to these populations;
- 6) stipulating in the law which factors must be used to evaluate the programs;
- 7) structuring a system at the State level composed of local representatives from vocational education schools, employment and training systems, vocational rehabilitation institutions, private industry concerns, and community-based organizations, to coordinate and determine vocational education policy according to the labor force needs of the State.

We have detailed our positions of the federal role on vocational education in the attached paper, which we offer for your consideration.

Please feel free to contact us for any other information on this matter.

Sincerely,

Anthony Gomes
Deputy National Director



Jobs For Progress, Inc.

POSITION PAPER

(DRAFT)

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

prepared by:

Jose E. Figueroa

Policy Analyst

SEF/Jobs for Progress, Inc.

109 2nd Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20002

Tel: (202) 546-9700

I. PURPOSE

There is a legitimate need for the involvement of the Federal Government in vocational education. Such a need is a consequence of inter-action between social and economic needs of our society.

The National Commission for Employment Policy, in its report entitled "The Federal Role in Vocational Education," established three arguments for the involvement of our national government in vocational education. The arguments are: efficiency, equity, and economies of scale.

The Commission's paper defines efficiency as the need for Federal Government intervention to obtain equilibrium between supply of skilled workers and the demands of the labor market. Maximizing the output of skilled labor markets requires government intervention and support of a vocational education system.

Equity, according to the Commission's paper, is the need for the Federal Government, as the highest public institution, to promote a more equitable distribution of resources to all the areas in the country participating in the program.

And economies of scale, the Commission continues, refers to the need for Federal resources to be allocated for research and experimental programs, which could not be as cost effective if conducted on a state-by-state basis. Such activities would best be implemented, therefore, with the technical and monetary support of the national government.

The need for a Federal role in vocational education is clearly carved in the present vocational education legislation. According to Section 101 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, the Federal policy seeks to assure

"that persons of all ages, in all communities of the State, those in High School, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, those with special educational handicaps, and those in post-secondary schools, will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of the actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training."

Based on this legitimate need for a Federal role in vocational education, this paper intends to establish the basis for a more efficient and effective involvement on the part of our national government in the country's vocational education system.

II. LEGISLATION*

In 1862 the Land Grant College Act established the precedent for a Federal role in vocational education. In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act further defined the role of the national government in this type of educational activity. And 1963, the Vocational Education Act re-defined the Federal role in this first contemporary legislation on such an important topic. The 1963 legislation was in turn amended in 1968 and 1976 to more clearly define the involvement of the Federal Government in vocational education.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, is basically divided in two parts. The first part consists of Federal assistance to the programs operated by the State Vocational Education system. This part has five subparts: General Provisions, Basic Grants, Program Improvement and Support Services, Special Programs for the Disadvantaged, and Consumer and Homemaking Education.

The second part consists of national programs. This part is, in turn, divided in four subparts: General Provisions, Programs of National Significance, Bilingual Vocational Training, and Emergency Assistance for Remodeling and Renovation of Vocational Facilities.

Federal funds for the first part are distributed directly from the U.S. Treasury to each of the States^{**}. The Government of each State is then responsible for re-distributing the national monies to local educational agencies (LEA's) and other eligible recipients.

* For a list of Vocational Education related bills in the 97th Congress, please refer to Appendix A.

**The term "state" refers not only to the 50 States but also to U.S. Territories, such as Puerto Rico.

The programs operated by the State Vocational Education systems receive approximately 98 percent of the total Federal expenditure for vocational education. The monies for the second part, National Programs, support activities conducted at the Federal level.

By law, each State must have an Advisory Council on Vocational Education to coordinate and oversee all vocational education activities.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT FEDERAL ROLE

The present vocational education system can be improved. First, the 1963 Vocational Education Act, as amended, intends to do too much with little resources. As mentioned before, the Federal policy seeks to assure "that all persons, of all ages, in all communities of the State, ... will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability ..."

These goals are too ambitious. Further, the Federal Government provides the States with little resources to accomplish those goals. In 1981, as well as 1980 and 1979, Federal monies accounted for approximately only nine (9) percent of the total amount of funds spent on vocational education, with State and local governments spending approximately \$6 billion for these activities.

In addition, the objectives of the programs to be funded with Federal monies are not always clear and, in fact, sometimes are contradictory. The law calls for Basic Grant funds, which constitute over 70 percent of the Federal contribution, to be used primarily for improvement of programs. However, the National Institute of Education, of the U.S. Department of education, in its most recent report on vocational education indicates that "it is not always clear what constitutes improvement and what is purely maintenance, and it is usually not known whether, a given expenditure draws on Federal or non-Federal funds. Therefore it is difficult to determine exactly what States and localities are doing to fulfill the Federal purpose of promoting

change in the vocational education enterprise."⁸ Along the same lines, the Institute also found that the objectives of the program improvement and other objectives of the Act are incompatible.

Another area that can be improved is the allocation of funds to States. Federal funds are appropriated using a formula which is based on the State's age groups population and on income factors. The amounts are allotted according to population groups and then are modified by the median income of each state.

There are two major weaknesses in the formula. First, it takes in consideration general population, not specific groups in the population that can benefit most. There is, then, no incentive for the State to increase the number of vocational education participants from groups such as those with high unemployment rates.

Second, the formula uses as an adjustment factor income median. Revenues available for education come from many sources: personal income is only one of them. Some States have large amounts of revenues from other sources but are below the national median in per capita income. A good example is Texas which has large amounts of revenue from oil production but is below the national average in per capita income. Therefore, this is not a valid adjustment factor.

⁸ National Institute of Education, The Vocational Education Study, page xxiv

In a fashion similar to the allocation of Federal monies, the intra-state distribution procedures of Federal funds are ambiguous and not always mutually reinforcing. The law establishes four factors that must be used in the redistribution formula. However, it does not restrict the States to these four factors nor does it require a specific formula.

The four factors are: economically depressed areas, areas with high rates of unemployment, areas with inadequate resources to provide for their vocational education needs, and those making efforts to meet the demand for workers in new and emerging field of employment. However, the States can use additional economic, social and demographic factors. All factors to be considered in the formula are not necessarily found to the same extent in the State's districts. Quoting from the Vocational Education Study by the National Institute of Education, "since the different factors are not necessarily mutually reinforcing and may even offset one another, actual distribution of funds appear more random than systematic."

It is the intention of the law that persons of all ages have ready access to vocational education of high quality which is realistic for gainful employment. It is also the intention of the law to promote a more equitable distribution of resources. Based on these intentions, specific programs were established for special populations. These programs have not, however, produced the results intended. A study on vocational education conducted by the University of California found that women are predominately in low-wage programs. The study also found that patterns of race and ethnicity were less pronounced. However, further analysis of their data shows that the ratio of White to any minority groups participating in secondary vocational education is disproportional to the ratio in post-secondary education. (Please refer to Table I).

TABLE I

STATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RATIOS*

<u>STATE</u>	<u>WHITE/BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE/HISPANIC</u>	<u>WHITE/ASIAN</u>	<u>WHITE/N.A.</u>
	<u>S/P</u>	<u>S/P</u>	<u>S/P</u>	<u>S/P</u>
California	3:1 / 10:1	1.3:1 / 8:1	7:1 / 16:1	52:1 / 75:1
Colorado	13:1 / 21:1	5.8:1 / 11:1	77:1 / 69:1	79:1 / 81.5:1
Florida	3:1 / 3:1	9:1 / 10.5:1	113:1/82:1	716:1/ 213:1
Illinois	3:1 / 3:1	22:1 / 30:1	133:1/66:1	917:1/193:1

S=secondary voc. ed.

P=post-secondary voc. ed.

* Adapted from data of The Distribution of Federal Funds Under the Vocational Education Act: Interstate and Intrastate Allocations, University of California, 1981

Another area that can be improved is evaluation of programs. The statutory requirements sought to force the States to include in evaluation the labor market demand and supply relationships. However, evaluation requirements are not specific enough and some have little validity and reliability. For example, States are required to use placement rates. Placement rates alone do not indicate the nature of the problem. A low placement rate could mean that 1) the program is irrelevant to the labor market; 2) the program is preparing the students poorly, or 3) the program was offered in an area of high unemployment.

Similarly, coordination with other educational training programs has not been successful. The law requires coordination of vocational education activities with employment and training activities (those funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act), vocational rehabilitation activities, public assistance activities, self-employment training, and social service programs. The National Commission for Employment Policy study on vocational education found that, although coordination is improving, it is not at the level mandated by law.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

"A seed was planted
and became a tree.
The tree gave fruit
and lived a long life.
Now that the tree
is too old to reproduce
it should be removed
so a new seed
can become a prolific tree."

Vocational education can be viewed in two different ways: as an all encompassing educational program or as an occupational training program. If it is viewed as an overall educational program then its main purpose is to help participants acquire the same basic skills taught at other academic institutions such as local high schools. On the other hand, if vocational education is viewed as an occupational training program then its purpose is to help participants to acquire specific skills relevant to occupations demanded by the labor market.

The trend of the Federal government has been to partially support vocational education. In the last few years Federal monies have accounted for approximately 9 percent of the total amount of monies spent in vocational education. This trend is expected to continue.

If the Federal resources used in vocational education will continue to be limited, then the scope of the Federal policy must be focused towards the most effective vocational programs where there is evidence of a legitimate Federal role. These programs are the occupational specific programs

especially at the post-secondary level. As mentioned before, studies by the National Commission for Employment Policy, the National Institute of Education, the Urban Institute, and others support the notion that there is little economic pay-off from secondary vocational education but that there is economic return from post-secondary vocational education.

I also recommend that the legislation continue basically divided in two: State programs and National programs. Ninety (90) percent of the Federal funds should go to State programs and ten (10) percent to National programs. Funds for the programs should be allocated through the following formulas:

A- State Programs

<u>Percentage of total State Programs</u>	<u>Programs</u>
25%	for programs for disadvantaged and limited English persons (with no less than half of these monies for post-secondary vocational education)
25%	for special non-traditional job training for women
35%	for post-secondary programs (at least half of this budget item for economically disadvantaged)
5%	for evaluation of local programs and for assessment of state labor market needs

<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Programs</u>
5%	for coordination with other vocational education-related systems
5%	for program improvement and administration costs (Program improvement- designed to help schools to smoothly move from obsolete programs (not related to labor market needs) to programs that relate to labor market realities.)
B- National Programs	
30%	for research and dissemination (labor market trend studies, job forecasting, etc.)
30%	for performance evaluation of state programs
40%	for experimental programs

The funds for state programs should be distributed to the states based on a formula using:

X of economically disadvantaged population

X of population between ages 16 and 25

X of women in the population

Teenage unemployment rate should be used as an adjustment factor.

The States must use the same formula to redistribute the Federal funds.

All the Federal monies must be used for occupational specific programs relevant to the local or state labor markets.

Evaluation criteria must be specified in the law. These criteria must be related to current and projected labor market needs and must be valid and reliable. Not just one factor should be used but a combination of scientifically weighted factors. Some of the criteria to be used should include: cost of training per participant in relation to national average costs, placement rate in relation to national placement rate, placement rate in relation to job openings, and placement rate in relation to unemployment rates. (For more details refer to appendix B)

I also recommend a restructuring of the Vocational education coordination system. I propose that at each local level^a a council should be appointed by the local board of education. The members of the council should be composed by local representatives from institutions of vocational education, employment and training, vocational rehabilitation, private industry and community-based organizations. The task of the council is to coordinate and determine vocational education policy at the local level according to the laborforce needs of the state.

The chairpersons of the local councils, in addition to experts in job forecasting and employment policy, will compose the state vocational education council. The State council will advise the local councils on state labor market needs. The state council will also coordinate the

^a The term local level refers to local labor market area as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor.

vocational education activities with other educational and training programs at the state level.

In conclusion, if these recommendations are followed, then indeed all persons will have ready access to vocational training of high quality, which is realistic in the light of the actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment.

Appendix A

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RELATED BILL-97th CONGRESS

- H.R. 66 FEDERAL AID TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
- H.R. 4974 VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE
- H.R. 5828 FEDERAL AID TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
- S. 952 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
- S. 2325 FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION (VOCATIONAL)
- S. 2599 VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE ACT OF 1982

Appendix B

SUGGESTED EVALUATION CRITERIA EXAMPLES

$$1) \quad i = \left(\frac{\text{Cost of training per participant}}{\text{National average training cost per participant}} \right) = C$$

$C \leq 0$ bad
 $C = 0$ average
 $C > 0$ good subject to further analysis

$$2) \quad \left(\frac{\text{Placement rate}}{\text{National Average placement rate}} \right) - 1 = P$$

$P \leq 0$ bad
 $P = 0$ average
 $P > 0$ good subject to further analysis

$$3) \quad 1 - \left(\frac{\% \text{ of job openings} - \% \text{ of participants (placement rate)}}{\% \text{ of job openings}} \right) = J$$

$J = 1$ perfect relationship between program
 and job openings (program is supplying
 all labor demanded)

$J = 0$ no relationship

subject to further
analysis

$$4) \quad \left(\frac{\text{Area unemployment}}{\text{national unemp.}} \right) \times \left(\frac{\text{Program placement}}{\text{national placement}} \right) = U$$

the greater the U the more effective
 the program

subject to further
analysis

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Vocational Association, "Sixteen resolutions: AVA Delegates call for National VOC ED Policy," Vocational Education, March 1979 p. 42-44
- Castro, Claudio de Moura, "Vocational education and the training of industrial labour in Brazil," International Labour Review, Vol. 118, no.3, Sep 1979 p.617-629
- Christoffel, Pamela M., Vocational Education: Alternatives for New Federal Legislation (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, Sep 1975)
- Ducray, C., "Vocational training today: the changing relationship between training and employment," International Labour Review, Vol 118, no.3, May 1979 p. 263-281
- Federal Board for Vocational Education, Yearbook 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974)
- Grasso, J.T. and Shea, J.R., "Effects of Vocational Education Programs: Research Findings and Issues", The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, April 1979)
- Grasso, J.T. and Shea, J.R., Vocational Education and Training: Impact on Youth, technical report for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1979)
- Jennings, John F., "What the Future Holds: A view from the Hill," Vocational Education, American Vocational Association, September 1979, p.22-24
- Law, Gordon F., Impact of Vocational Education and Manpower Training on the Labor Market, Project Baseline Supplemental Report (Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University, August 1974)
- Lee, Arthur M. and Tower, C.O., A data base for vocational education and manpower training, Project Baseline Supplemental Report (Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University, October 1974)
- Mangum, Garth L., Reorienting Vocational Education, Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations no. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations and National Manpower Policy Task Force, May 1978)

Mayer, Robert H., An Economic Analysis of Vocational Education (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, prepared for the National Commission for Employment Policy, August 1981)

National Commission for Employment Policy, Seventh Annual Report: The Federal Interest in Employment and Training (Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, October 1981)

National Commission for Employment Policy, The Federal Role in Vocational Education (Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, September 1981)

National Institute of Education, The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report, Publication no. 8 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, September 1981)

Olesenski, Donna and Moss, Philip, The Impact of Vocational Training and the Role of Size of Firm (Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Commission for Employment Policy, May 1981)

Operations Research, Inc., Report of the Analysis Group NEW Vocational Education Review Task Force (Silver Spring, MD: Operations Research, Inc., September 1970)

Iverson, Gordon I., "The Federal Role in Vocational Education," Vocational Education, American Vocational Association, October 1979, p. 48-50

U.S. Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, Education for a Changing world of Work (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1963)



Congressional Research Service
The Library of Congress

Washington, D.C. 20540

October 29, 1982

TO : House Elementary, Secondary and
Vocational Education Subcommittee
Attention: Nancy Kober

FROM : Paul Irwin
Specialist in Education
Education and Public Welfare Division

SUBJECT : Availability of Data With Regard to Vocational Education
Programs At Postsecondary Institutions

In response to your request of October 12, 1982, on the availability of data with regard to vocational education programs at postsecondary institutions we have made a number of inquiries. In particular, you were interested in the differentiation of postsecondary financial information according to the type of student (postsecondary versus adult) or the type of postsecondary institution. As indicated in our telephone conversation of October 27, we found that various types of enrollment and participation data are collected but that financial data are generally not collected with regard to specific types of postsecondary vocational programs. These findings confirm the information you reported that was supplied to you by the Department of Education.

Section 110(c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 requires that at least 15 percent of each State's Federal funds for basic grants and program improvement and supportive services be used for programs, services, and activities for persons who have completed or otherwise left high school. Specifically, subsection c distinguishes two types of participants:

- (1) persons who have completed or left high school and who are enrolled in organized programs of study for which credit is given toward an associate or other degree, but which programs are not designed as baccalaureate or higher degree programs; and

- (2) persons who have already entered the labor market, or are unemployed, or who have completed or left high school and who are not described in paragraph (1).

Program regulations (34 CFR 400.314) identify programs serving the first type of participant as "postsecondary programs" and those serving the second type as "adult programs." However, the legislation itself does not use these terms, and in general, the regulations do not use this distinction for any consequent requirements. In addition, only two types of "eligible recipients" are distinguished in the legislation--"local educational agencies" and "postsecondary education institutions" (section 195(13)). The term "postsecondary education institution" is defined as:

a nonprofit institution legally authorized to provide postsecondary education within a State for persons sixteen years of age or older, who have graduated from or left elementary or secondary school (section 195(12)).

The primary source of statistical data on vocational education is the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS), administered by the National Center for Education Statistics of the Department of Education. We talked with Mr. Nick Osso of VEDS, searched through the VEDS publication ("The Condition of Vocational Education,") and examined the VEDS questionnaires. We found nothing that would necessarily distinguish between the postsecondary and adult students identified in paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 110(c), and nothing that would distinguish financial data between postsecondary and adult programs. (However, expenditure data are available for postsecondary and adult programs as a whole; for special needs students, i.e., handicapped, disadvantaged, and limited-English proficiency; for major elements of the vocational education legislation, e.g., work-study programs, cooperative education, construction; and for types of instruction, e.g., agriculture, distributive, health.)

Some data are also collected through the administration of the program itself. We talked with Dr. Leroy Cornelsen and Mr. Kent Bennion of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education of the Department of Education. They explained that data collected through the operation of the program would not directly respond to your information needs. However, they said that State plans and annual accountability reports might provide some of the desired information to the extent that States must indicate the allocation of Federal funds to individual institutions; knowing the identity of the institutions might indicate the likelihood of whether the funds were used for postsecondary or adult programs. They stated that, on request, departmental staff might be able to summarize the information related to your request that is contained in the State reports.

The National Institute of Education undertook a major, 4-year study of vocational education, with a final report issued in September 1981. We talked with Dr. Henry David, director of the study, and reviewed the various reports from the study itself. According to Dr. David, the VEDS data collection represents the only comprehensive source of statistical information on postsecondary vocational programs. He also indicated that postsecondary programs were not addressed to any significant degree in the Institute's study because so little research and evaluation has been done on that topic in the past. One of the major subcontracts of the Institute's study did undertake some major data collection--the Project on National Vocational Education Resources, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley. The project examined vocational programs in seven large cities; however, the section in the final report (September 1981) describing postsecondary vocational education is relatively short (6 out of 402 pages) and does not describe expenditures with regard to the types of students (postsecondary or adult) in these institutions, nor did the

CRS-4

report provide separate expenditure data for postsecondary and adult institutions.

We also searched various evaluation reports and related materials on vocational education published by the Department of Education and private organizations; none of these provided data on vocational expenditures on the types of postsecondary students or types of postsecondary institutions that you requested.

We hope you will find this information helpful; if clarification is needed, please feel free to contact us.